FOREST DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Period: 2001 - 2006

Merritt Forest District

Merritt Timber Supply Area

Ministry of Forests

Small Business Forest Enterprise Program

Licence Number A16133

Merritt Forest District
PO Box 4400 Station Main
Merritt, BC V1K 1B8
Phone: **(250) 378-8400** Fax: **(250) 378-8481**

Small Business Officer:	Name:	Len Marsh, RPF
	Date:	
RPF Signature:	Name:	Peter Stroes, RPF
	Date:	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 PURPOSE 1
1.2 THE SMALL BUSINESS FOREST ENTERPRISE PROGRAM 1
1.2.1 ADVERTISING OF A TIMBER SALE LICENCE 3
1.2.2 CLIENTS 5
1.2.3 CATEGORIES OF CLIENTS 5
1.2.4 ALLOWABLE ANNUAL CUT 9
1.3 SBFEP PLAN AREA 10
1.4 REFERRAL PROCESS 11
1.5 REFERRAL SUMMARY 11

2. STATEGIC PLANS 13

2.1 HIGHER LEVEL PLANS 13
2.1.1 LIST OF HIGHER LEVEL PLANS 13
2.1.2 MEASURES TO ADDRESS HIGHER LEVEL PLAN OBJECTIVES 13
2.2 OTHER PLANS 15

3. MEASURES TO PROTECT FOREST RESOURCES 16

3.1 TIMBER 16
3.2 WATER 25
3.3 FISHERIES 27
3.4 RIPARIAN MANAGEMENT 27
3.5 WILDLIFE 32
3.6 RECREATION 33
3.7 BOTANICAL FOREST PRODUCTS 33
3.8 RANGE 34
3.9 BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY 36
3.9.1 GENERAL OBJECTIVES RESPECTING TARGET LEVELS OF COARSE WOODY DEBRIS RETENTION 36
3.9.2 WILDLIFE TREE PATCH RETENTION 37
3.9.3 PROPOSED FOREST CONNECTIVITY CORRIDORS 38
3.10 CULTURAL HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES 38
3.11 FIRE HAZARD AND PREVENTION 39
3.1.2 SMALL SCALE SALVAGE PROGRAM 46
3.12 VISUAL LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT 47

4. HARVESTING SECTION - CATEGORY A CUTBLOCK STRATEGIES 49

4.1 HARVEST SUMMARY TABLE 49

5. FOREST PRACTICES CODE VARIANCES 65

5.1 FDP VARIANCE 65
5.2 HARVESTING VARIANCE 67
5.3 ACCESS VARIANCE 67

6. ACCESS MANAGEMENT 68

6.1 ACCESS MANAGEMENT GENERAL 68
6.1.1 ROAD CONSTRUCTION, MODIFICATION, AND ASSESSMENT TABLE 68
6.1.2 INTERIM ROAD DEACTIVATION TABLE 73
6.1.3 LEVEL OF ACCESS TYPE 73

6.2 Access Maintenance 76
6.3 Seasonal Use Roads 76
7.1 Advertisements 77
7.2 Review and Comment / Documentation and Referral 78
7.2.1 Letters 78
7.2.2 First Nations 79
7.2.3 Agencies 82
7.3 Summary of Revisions 86
7.4 Category A Cutblock Issues Tables 87
7.5 Amendment Log 95

8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION 96

9. MAPS 97

9.1 Status Maps 97

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide a framework that describes and illustrates where and how harvesting, road development, maintenance and deactivation will be managed in the Small Business Forest Enterprise Program (SBFEP) for a five-year period.

This Forest Development Plan (FDP) outlines for administering government agencies, the public (including special interest groups), First Nations and license holders, information on harvesting and road development activities planned to be undertaken in the next five years in the area under the plan. It communicates resource value management strategies and measures that will be carried through subsequent operational plans and operations for the term of this plan. Finally, it provides information on ministry road modification, maintenance and deactivation.

It provides information through maps, tables, and text for public and agency review and comment on the location and scheduling of harvest and road activities. Comments received during the review period will be considered in the final submission.

Legal requirements for the content of FDP's are contained within *the Forest Practices Code of British Columbia Act (FPC of BC Act)*, and the *Operational Planning Regulations* (*OPR*). Activities will be conducted in accordance with the act and associated regulations, and any higher level plan (objective) as they apply when they come into effect.

This plan, as amended from time to time, will be updated and resubmitted toward the end of the term.

1.2 The Small Business Forest Enterprise Program

Through the SBFEP, Crown timber is sold to harvesting and milling individuals and firms registered in the program under the authority of the *Forest Act*. In addition, the program provides opportunities for numerous private sector contractors who construct roads, reforest and tend the land, measure and protect the timber resource and assist in the planning of forest management activities.

Provincially, the program has four main objectives:

- Access to Timber: The program provides opportunities for individuals and firms in the forest industry to acquire timber for their operations, and for individuals and firms to enter the industry and establish new businesses.

- Diversification and Employment: The program provides timber to support and promote small mill and value added mill (specialty and high value forest products) operators, and to generate employment.

- Competition and Fair Profit: The marketing of timber through a competitive process helps the province meet its SBFEP objectives for jobs, fiscal management and fair return on the provincial timber resource. Some of the timber allocated is awarded to market loggers and to small sawmill operators with the prime objective of maximizing revenue to the crown. The remainder is awarded to companies that, in addition to financial objectives, best meet employment objectives. These sales normally go to entrepreneurs and companies that create or maintain jobs by re-manufacturing timber and lumber to make value added products.

- Sound Forest Management: In most cases, planning and layout is completed by Forest Service staff or consultants prior to sale. In some cases successful bidders must prepare or hire consultants to prepare detailed harvesting plans. The Ministry of Forests must approve these plans before harvesting and road construction can proceed. Small Scale Salvage was added to the SBFEP in 1998 to increase opportunity and focus efforts on recovery of damaged timber.

The program is managed on a business enterprise basis through the Small Business Forest Enterprise Account. The program is self-financed through the account and program costs are debited from the account. These costs include office operations, timber cruising, environmental protection, engineering, archaeological and waste/residue surveys, layout, and basic silviculture.

Funds to pay for future reforestation are reserved in the account at the end of each year and revenues in excess of current expenditures and future reforestation costs may be returned to the province's Consolidated Revenue Fund.

- **Competitive Sales** (Section 20 bonus bid): whereby market loggers and registered sawmills are awarded timber sales based primarily on the contribution to the Crowns forest revenue objectives and forest management practices. These sales are usually for a term of one or two years. There are two types of competitive sales;

  Category 1 - these sales are advertised with the restriction that only market loggers may bid.

  Category 2 - these sales are advertised with a restriction that only persons or corporations with a timber processing facility may bid. These sales typically support small sawmills that produce ties or rough lumber.

  Category 3 – these sales are advertised to registrants who do not have a mill or processing facility but commit to building one, if awarded the timber sale. As Category 2, these sales typically support small sawmills that produce ties or rough lumber.

106-01600/

- **Bid Proposal Sales** (Section 21): referred to as " value added sales" whereby registered sawmill operators and re-manufacturers are awarded sales based on the proposed contribution to employment, economic diversification, community stability, and sound forest management practices. Under certain circumstances this type of sale may be sold in category 1 under small scale salvage but is more commonly sold under category 2.

- **Non Replaceable Forest License** (NRFL, Section 13): this is another avenue in which SBFEP can sell volume.

- **Small Scale Salvage Initiative** (Section 20 / 23): this initiative of the SBFEP is designed to expand employment opportunities for small scale loggers, address forest health issues, further utilize imperiled timber, and provide economic benefits to communities. Salvage sales will be offered competitively or with direct sales to a maximum of 2000m³.

1.2.1 Advertising of a Timber Sale Licence

An advertisement inviting applications for a forest licence or a timber sale licence shall,

(1) where

(a) the total volume of timber to be authorized for harvesting under the licence is less than 2,000m³, or;

(b) the timber must be removed expeditiously because it is in imminent danger of being damaged, destroyed, or otherwise lost, be published at least once, a minimum of 5 days before the date of sale, in at least one newspaper circulating in or near the area proposed for the licence.

(2) where the total volume of timber to be authorized for harvesting under the licence is 2,000m³ or more, but less than 15,000m³, be published

(a) in at least one issue of the Gazette, and;

(b) at least once, within a period of 3 consecutive weeks following the date of the publication in the Gazette, in at least one newspaper circulating in or near the area proposed for the licence.

(3) where the total volume of timber to be authorized for harvesting under the licence is 15,000m³ or more, but less than 100,000m³, be published

(a) in at least one issue of the Gazette, and;

(b) at least once every 2 weeks, within a period of 4 consecutive weeks following the date of publication in the Gazette, in at least one newspaper circulating in or near the area proposed for the licence, or

(4) where the total volume of timber to be authorized for harvesting under the licence is 100,000m³ or more, be published

(a) in at least one issue of the Gazette, and;

(b) at least once every 2 weeks, within a period of 8 consecutive weeks following the date of the publication in the Gazette, in at least one newspaper circulating in or near the area proposed for the licence.

Exceptions

The only exception to the above is section 23 of the *Forest Act* which allows us to enter into agreement to sell timber directly to clients if:

(1) The timber sale licence is required to satisfy the obligations of the government under a pulpwood agreement,

(2) an applicant for a tree farm licence, in the minister's opinion, requires for the applicant's current operations timber on the land described in the application, and the land described in the application is under reserve under section 33(8) of the *Forest Act*,

(3) timber, in the opinion of the Regional Manager or District Manager,

(i) is in danger, as a result of an insect infestation, fire, disease or windthrow, of being significantly reduced in value, lost or destroyed, and

(ii) must be removed to prevent the reduction in value, loss or destruction.

(4) Crown land is to be used for experimental purposes and, in the opinion of the Regional Manager or District Manager, timber is to be harvested under controlled scientific or investigative conditions.

(5) a timber sale licence has been advertised, applications are made within the time specified in the advertising, and the application is made within 60 days after that time.

(6) the timber sale licence is with a person that, in conjunction with the SBFEP, is contracted by the government to construct major works, for example, a forest access road, and in the opinion of the Regional Manager or District Manager, it is desirable to remove timber from the contract area in coordination with the works contract, or

(7) the timber sale licence is with a person carrying out activities under a range use plan or under a consent under section 101 or 102 of the *FPC of BC Act*.

(8) the volume of timber specified in the application is less than 2,000 m³ and only one application is made for the timber.

(9) the estimate of the volume of timber to be harvested under the licence is not greater than 500m³.

These sections, of the *Forest Act* provide the authority to tender or provide timber to our clients. With the exception of timber awarded under section 23, quoted above, and Bid Proposal or Value Added Sales, timber is awarded based upon the highest bonus bid received.

1.2.2 Clients

The SBFEP has five categories of clients. Registrants under the Small Business Forest Enterprise Regulation (B.C. Reg. 265/88) in categories one, two, three; bid proposal (value added) clients in category two; non-registrants; and contractors. Although we occasionally sell timber to non-registrants it is not a common occurrence.

1.2.3 Categories of Clients

Category 1

1) A person may be registered as a small business forest enterprise in category 1 if he/she meets each of the requirements of subsection (2) (below) and applies to a Regional Manager or District Manager in a manner approved by that manager.

1.1 For the purposes of subsection (2), "shareholder" means a shareholder of a corporation who, directly or indirectly, beneficially owns more than 10% of the issued and outstanding voting shares of the corporation.

2) In order to be registered under this section a person must:

(a) be an individual at least 19 years old or be a corporation registered in British Columbia,

(b) not be:

(i) registered in a category under this regulation for a period for which application under subsection (1) is made, or

(ii) a shareholder of a corporation registered in a category under this regulation for a period for which application under subsection (1) is made, or

(iii) a corporation that has a shareholder who is also a shareholder of a corporation registered in a category under this regulation for a period for which application under subsection (1) is made.

(c) not be the holder of a licence or agreement the rights under which are suspended under section 76 or 78 of the *Forest Act*,

(d) be an individual who has at least one year of experience in logging or is a corporation having as a shareholder an individual who has at least one year of experience in logging,

(e) not own or lease a timber processing facility, and

(f) not

(i) hold;

(ii) be a shareholder in a corporation that holds;

(iii) be a corporation that has a shareholder who is also a shareholder in a corporation that holds a pulpwood agreement or one or more major licenses that together have an aggregate allowable annual cut of greater than 10,000m³.

3) A person may not be registered under this section where there is a fee, royalty, stumpage or other sum imposed under the *Forest Act* payable to the Crown by him or another person in his stead, except where arrangements satisfactory to the Regional Manager or District Manager have been made for the payment of the sum.

Category 2 & 3

1) A person may be registered as a small business forest enterprise in category 2,3 if he/she meets each of the requirements of subsection (2) and applies to a Regional Manager or District Manager in a manner approved by the manager.

2) In order to qualify for registration under this section, a person must meet the requirements of section 1 (2) (a) and (c) (under the category one requirements) and 3) and must:

(a) own/lease or have proven commitment to construct a timber processing facility in British Columbia in respect of which no other person is registered in a category under this regulation for a period for which application under subsection (1) is made,

(b) not

(i) hold;

(ii) be in control of a corporation that holds;

(iii) be a corporation that has 50% or more of its shares held by one or more shareholders who are also shareholders in a corporation that holds, or

(iv) be a corporation that is controlled by a corporation that is also in control of a corporation that holds a pulpwood agreement or one or more major licenses that together have an aggregate allowable annual cut of greater than 10,000m^3, and

(c) not own or lease a sawmill unless exempted by the minister from this requirement.

Bid Proposal (value-added)

The value-added sector is part of category two. It is distinct in that the registrant must produce a value-added product and the timber is awarded based upon its potential for:

(a) creating or maintaining employment opportunities and other social benefits in British Columbia,

(b) providing for the management and utilization of Crown timber,

(c) furthering the development objectives of the government,

(d) meeting objectives of the government in respect of environmental quality and the management of water, fisheries, wildlife and cultural heritage resources, and

(e) contributing to government revenues.

Non-registrants

We encourage all clients within the SBFEP system to register in the program and for our larger sales it is generally mandatory. There are however, the occasional requests from clients that require small volumes of timber. In addition, timber is awarded with road construction contracts. We do not require these clients to register in the program. This category of client is not a major consideration in the program.

Contractors

In addition to clients who purchase timber, we deal with a wide variety of clients in managing the program. Some of these contractors carry out works in the following areas:

- Developing Plan Mapping
- Total Resource Planning
- Road Layout
- Cruising
- Silviculture Prescription
- Block Layout
- Wildlife Inventories
- Stream Inventories
- Terrain Assessments
- Site Preparation
- Planting
- Silviculture Surveys

In summary, our clients have a variety of needs and one of our primary goals and responsibilities is to maintain enough flexibility in the program to meet them. This at times requires visiting and addressing specific client concerns and needs. We attempt, based upon client input, to hold at least one registrant meeting a year at which we discuss issues and client requirements. Additionally, we meet with individual clients on an ongoing basis or at their request.

1.2.4 Allowable Annual Cut

The Merritt Forest District's SBFEP has an annual allowable cut apportionment of 180,738m³/year. This includes the 35,000m³/year uplift in Annual Allowable Cut (AAC) experienced by the SBFEP as of January 1, 1996 from the "smallwood" apportionment accrued to the Merritt TSA. The entire Smallwood Apportionment will be sold as Non-replaceable Forest Licenses. As such, these areas will not be shown in the SBFEP FDP after this plan. The successful licensees are accountable to submit their own FDP's. Currently, because one of the licenses is still under review at the time of this submission, we are showing Category A and I approved blocks in our plan so that they are not lost from the planning process. The total SBFEP AAC is broken into components as noted below:

Component	Apportionment
Bigwood	
Category 1	58,700
Small Scale Salvage	11,500
Category Two (Sawmillers)	11,500
Category Two and Three (Bid Proposal)	64,038
Total Bigwood	145,738
Smallwood NRFL	35,000
Total Bigwood and Smallwood	**180,738**

The program's previous cut control period ended on December 31, 1996. The SBFEP cut control is not legislatively controlled as are other licenses, however, we are expected to sell the assigned apportionment each year under our Cut Control Policy. The ability to develop and sell the apportionment is one of the primary measures of the program's success.

The SBFEP plans to sell these specified volumes in timber sales each year with an obligation to balance the cut within 10% at the end of the five-year period. Annual fluctuations of up to 50% are permitted.

1.3 SBFEP Plan Area

It is a requirement of the FDP process, that a licensee operate within the timber and topographic profile of a Timber Supply Area (TSA). In determining the locations of SBFEP charts, the program was given areas from within the major licensees chart areas. During this process, a cross section of topography, timber types, logging chance and methods was developed such that the cumulative area we have under chart is representative of the TSA. During the term of this plan the SBFEP has been focusing harvesting within the southern most charts in efforts to control and reduce un-salvaged losses due to the Mountain pine beetle epidemic. In doing so, the SBFEP has deviated from the above requirement of dispersing its cut across the TSA. Upon control of the mountain pine beetle epidemic the SBFEP will disperse the cut across the timber and topographic profile of the chart areas.

The SBFEP has 38 operating areas (charts) within which timber volume is developed. These charts envelop a planning area of approximately 60,000 hectares. In some cases, such as timber trades with other licensees on special projects, or where assisting licensees with beetle infestations under a Undeveloped Timber Sale License (UTSL), individual blocks are developed outside of these designated areas.

At present the SBFEP has approximately 55 years of cut allocated within our chart areas. Assisting other licensees with the harvest of beetle infested timber outside of our operating areas has for the present offset the need for the expansion of additional SBFEP operating area. As in previous plans, it should be noted that the SBFEP is the third largest licensee in the district, yet has the smallest total operating area within which to sustain it's cut. It is expected that within the foreseeable future this will affect the program's ability to function.

Due to the recent Mountain pine beetle uplift, the SBFEP has used the UTSL as a tool to accelerate the rate of cut within the Merritt TSA. In essence, this means that the uplift volume is being amended to the SBFEP in the form of UTSL's. This being the case, the SBFEP has a significant level of development located outside of their chart areas. This is occurring primarily in the southern end of the district where beetle populations are largest, and to a lesser extent in the northern portion of the district where beetle populations are lower (it should be noted that part of the uplift and associated UTSL's have also been attributed to the Tulameen fire salvage operations). It is critical to note that the SBFEP only takes responsibility for the specific roads and cutblocks associated with the above sales, and that forest management conducted outside of these boundaries are the sole responsibility of the forest licensee to which the UTSL area applies.

The SBFEP chart areas, small scale salvage areas, UTSL's, and less common, timber trades, will form the "area under the plan" for the purposes of Section 9 of the OPR.

Review the Forest Development Maps to view the area under the plan.

Note: The above UTSL information was gathered, prepared and submitted by the UTSL holder as an amendment to the 1998 SBFEP FDP. It is recognized that all uplift UTSL information included within this plan has previously undergone district review for the requirements pursuant to the *FPC of BC Act* and consistency with the approved 1998 SBFEP FDP. The SBFEP has used this information coupled with district input to include the UTSL's within this plan. Information used within this submission was the best available information at the time.

1.4 Referral Process

The SBFEP of the Ministry of Forests has the responsibility to ensure that public, First Nations, resource agencies and other agreement holders have the opportunity to review and comment on the location and scheduling of proposed harvest and road construction, maintenance and deactivation activities. The SBFEP carries out its responsibilities through the public referral process. This process deals with the technical aspects of forest management and harvesting. Public referrals are a requirement of the *FPC of BC Act*. Referrals made are listed in the summary chart below.

1.5 Referral Summary

This plan is the SBFEP's principal referral document for public and other resource users. In order to provide for review and receive their comments, the plan was advertised and made available for review and comment at the scheduled open house sessions listed below. It was also made available for review at the Merritt Forest District Office, between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday during the review and comment period of April 2 through June 4, 2001. A referral copy was also provided to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) and Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks (MELP) (see referral chart below) and required First Nations groups. Letters were sent to other resource users (range tenure holders, guide/outfitters, trappers, etc.) in the district who may potentially be affected by SBFEP proposed activity. Comments received are not included as part of the plan but are submitted with the plan in accordance with section 30 of the OPR.

Referral Summary Chart

Activity	Expected Date (yyyy/mm/dd)	Location and media	Comments received Y/N	Date
Submission of FDP				
MOF	2001/04/02	PO Box 4400 STN Main Merritt BC, V1K 1B8	Y	2001/05/16
Department of Fisheries and Oceans	2001/04/02	1278 Dalhousie Drive Kamloops BC, VQC 6G3	N	--
Ministry of Environment, Land and Parks	2001/04/02	PO Box 4400 STN Main Merritt BC, V1K 1B8	Y	2001/05/22
Ranchers	2001/04/02	Letter of invitation to review	N	--
Trappers/Guides	2001/04/02	Letter of invitation to review	N	--
Other	2001/04/02	Letter of invitation to review	N	--
First Nations				
Nicola Tribal Association	2001/04/02	Box 188, Merritt BC V1K 1B8	Y	2001/09/21
Upper Similkameen Indian Band	2001/04/02	Box 310, Keremeos, BC V0X 1N0	Y	2001/09/10
Upper Nicola Indian Band	2001/04/02	Box 3700, Merritt BC V1K 1B8	Y	2001/07/10
Westbank Indian Band	2001/04/02	301-515 Hwy 97 South Kelowna, BC V1Z 3J2	N	--
Public Review				
Advertising	2001/03/21	Local Papers	N	--
Public Viewing	2001/03/28	Merritt Civic Center	N	--
Public Viewing	2001/03/29	Princeton Legion Hall	Y	2001/03/29
Public Viewing	2001/04/02	PO Box 4400 STN Main Merritt BC V1K 1B8	Y	2001/04/01
Comments Deadline	2001/06/04		--	--
Agency Meetings			--	--
SBFEP/MOF	2001/05/15		--	--
Final Submission for approval	2001/08/15		--	--
Expected Approval	2001/10/15	Merritt Forest District	--	--

2. STRATEGIC PLANS

2.1 Higher Level Plans

2.1.1 List of Higher Level Plans

On January 31, 2000, the District Manager of the Merritt Forest District set objectives for all established recreation sites and trails in the Merritt TSA.

2.1.2 Measures to Address Higher Level Plan Objectives

The SBFEP will ensure that all proposed operations are consistent with the above stated objectives and will consult the District Recreation Officer where required. Following are all trails and sites that may impact SBFEP development and whether the FDP is consistent with the set objectives.

Chart Area	Rec. site/trail	General Objectives	Consistency
Elusive Creek	Vinson Lake (site)	Semi primitive non-motorized	Y
Ketchan	Mystery Lake (site)	Semi primitive non-motorized	Y
Ketchan	Stringer Lake (site)	Roaded	Y
Ketchan	Power Lake (site)	Roaded	Y
Ketchan	Butler Lake (site/trail)	Semi primitive non-motorized	Y
Ketchan	Gill Lake (site)	Roaded	Y
Ketchan	Gill Lake (trail)	Semi primitive non-motorized	Y
Mine Creek	Little Douglas Lake (site)	Semi primitive non-motorized	Y
Mine Creek	Little Douglas Lake (trail)	Semi primitive non-motorized	Y
Pennask	Jackson Lake (site/trail)	Semi primitive non-motorized	**
Pennask	Norgaard Lake (trail)	Semi primitive non-motorized	Y
Pennask	Little Spahomin Lake (site/trail)	Semi primitive non-motorized	Y
Pimainus	Pimainus Lake (site)	Roaded	Y
Railroad Creek	Vuich Falls (site)	Roaded	Y
Shea Lake	Shea Lake (site)	Roaded	Y
Tyner Lake	Tyner Lake (site)	Roaded	Y
Tyner Lake	Farr Lake (site)	Roaded	Y

** **note:** the proposed development in the vicinity of Jackson Lake is being assessed by the district. No further activity will occur within this chart unless it is consistent with the established objectives as stated above.

As SBFEP Small Scale Salvage operations can not be planned and occur across the district they are not included in the above table. Small Scale Salvage operations will be consistent with the objectives set for any established recreation site or trail within the Merritt TSA.

2.2 Other Plans

Pennask Local Resource Use Plan

The SBFEP has two areas that overlap the Pennask Lake Local Resource Use Plan. These are the Pennask Lake chart which falls completely within the Local Resource Use Plan area and Pattinson Lake that is partially within the Local Resource Use Plan area. Both charts will be managed in a manner consistent with the Local Resource Use Plan.

Lakes Classification Local Resource Use Plan

See section 3.4, Riparian Management.

3. MEASURES TO PROTECT FOREST RESOURCES

3.1 Timber

3.1.1 Forest Health

Issues

Measures to protect the forest resources within the area under the plan for the SBFEP must consider the implications of forest health factors. Forest health factors may significantly decrease timber production and have serious implications on other resource values (such as water quality, aesthetics and landscape values). With this in mind, forest management prioritizes harvest, and identifies salvage and treatment opportunities in order to minimize the negative effects of forest health. The above process must also consider non-timber resources.

It should be noted that in many instances salvage harvest will result in an amendment to this plan. If this is to occur, the amendment process will follow the referral and comment requirements as outlined in the *FPC of BC Act*.

Merritt TSA Forest Health Unit Strategy

The unit strategy is a forum in which the Ministry of Forests and the SBFEP discuss responsibility and priority for the harvest and further treatment of infected/affected stands. This occurs quarterly and is based on information gathered from aerial overviews and ground detection. Treatments resulting from the unit strategy may vary from harvest in the higher risk and heavily infested stands as opposed to single tree disposal or MSMA in areas of lower risk and lower infestation levels. The SBFEP views this as an important strategy to controlling forest pests and diseases within the Merritt TSA, and is committed to working with this strategy in their areas of operation. Maps, schedules and commitments made at these meetings form an integral part of this strategy and operations will be carried out within the area of the plan in accordance with the strategy and consistent with the plan (FDP) or approved amendments where required.

Mountain Pine Beetle

Occurrence

The mountain pine beetle (IBM) is the most destructive pest organism currently affecting forest resources within the planning area. If not aggressively managed this insect will have significant impacts on wood quality, timber supply and associated forest resources.

At present, the southern end of the Merritt TSA is experiencing an epidemic of IBM. This is largely due to increased beetle populations and an abundance of mature and over-mature lodgepole pine

The SBFEP have several charts which have been affected by the beetle epidemic. The most severely affected by the IBM are Wolfe-Belgie, Copper Creek, Whipsaw, Jameson, Loon Lake and Ketchan charts.

Both the Wolfe-Belgie and Copper Creek chart areas are at high risk and are also currently expressing the highest levels of attack. Infestation levels have increased in the Loon Lake and Ketchan charts. The SBFEP is dealing with the infestations in the above chart areas aggressively. The Jameson and Whipsaw charts have been extensively harvested over the last 10 years, primarily in efforts to control the IBM. In doing so, the majority of pine has been harvested, thus reducing the hazard and risk of infestation.

Within the beetle epidemic area (mostly south of Princeton) the SBFEP has issued numerous UTSL's in an effort to increase harvesting power to aid in the control of the beetle. Levels of infestation within these areas are extremely high. These areas can be identified by viewing the UTSL development plan maps. IBM in the remaining SBFEP chart areas (north of Princeton) are primarily experiencing endemic levels of infestation with isolated occurrences of attack.

Management Objective

In efforts to control the IBM epidemic, the Merritt Forest District is implementing the "Mountain Pine beetle Strategy for the Merritt TSA (dated January 6, 2000)". The SBFEP will be consistent with this strategy and is committed to being a key player in its implementation.

The objectives for the term of this plan are:

- to reduce the spread and impact of beetle populations;

- to reduce beetle populations and maintain them at manageable endemic levels;

- to minimize unsalvaged losses;

- to consider other resource values when development planning;

- and where opportunities exist, to manage landscapes in a manner which reduce both current and future stand susceptibility.

In the four southern charts within the beetle epidemic area (as described earlier) it is expected that beetle populations will be reduced during the first year of harvest.

Strategy

Strategies to be employed by the SBFEP will be in a manner consistent with the 'General Management Strategies' as described in the 'Bark Beetle Management Guidebook'. While all six management strategies may be employed across our chart areas in varying degrees, we will elaborate on the strategies being used to control the IBM epidemic.

Two zones being actively managed to control the IBM and deal with salvage/sanitation harvest are the 'Maintain Low/Salvage Zone' and the 'Suppression Zone'. The 'Maintain Low/Salvage Zone' is predominantly comprised of moderate to high susceptible stands currently under the influence of high to severe beetle incidence. This area encompasses the Wolfe-Belgie, Jameson and Copper Creek chart areas as well as the majority of the UTSL areas. The 'Suppression Zone' is predominantly comprised of moderate to high susceptible stands currently under the influence of low to moderate beetle incidence. This area is predominantly north of Princeton and comprises the majority of the SBFEP chart areas, excluding higher elevation chart areas such as Arrastra, Railroad, Champion, Mine and July Creek.

The intent of the 'Maintain Low/Salvage Zone' is to target areas of new infestations that can be managed and harvested on a priority basis. This is usually based on risk to other resources as well as susceptibility and risk to adjacent stands. The strategy within this zone is also to identify areas that have experienced extensive infestation and are feasible and economical to harvest in an effort to recover timber values before they are lost. The latter part of this strategy is only to be employed if there is sufficient resources being allocated to the identification and harvest of newly identified high risk areas.

The intent of the 'Suppression Zone' is to maintain beetle populations at endemic levels. In doing so, identification and ground detection of newly infested sites is paramount. Each infected site is to be evaluated and if applicable, a single treatment or treatment combination will be applied. If warranted and operationally feasible a harvest treatment will be given first consideration. This strategy will be used until moderate to high hazard stands are removed, until the infestation collapses, or until infestation levels exceed the resources available for a suppression program.

Tactics

Managing forests to reduce the impacts of bark beetles and treating individual infestations to reduce subsequent spread require the application of a combination of treatments. No single treatment is suitable for dealing with all bark beetles or for all situations. Following aerial and ground detection recces the SBFEP discuss tactics to be employed for infested areas at the Merritt Forest Health Unit Strategy Meetings. At these meetings, potential impacts on resource values are discussed (or highlighted for further review with appropriate agencies), risk and hazard ratings are weighed and tactics are agreed to. The tactics and tools used for beetle management within the SBFEP chart areas are:

- utilizing hazard and risk rating maps of pine stands;
- participating in quarterly meetings with the Merritt Forest District at Unit Strategy Meetings;
- annual overview flights and detailed sketch mapping of infested polygons;
- intensive ground probe and recce information of all infested polygons;
- single tree treatments including fall and burn, MSMA, single tree selection and small patch harvest;
- aggressive direct harvesting of all infested polygons, within the current flight period if planning constraints permit;
- pheromone placement programs for both single tree and harvest treatments (particularly if harvesting past flight);
- actively participating in the Small Scale Salvage Program across the TSA (further detail will be provided re: SSS);
- where operationally feasible, total chance access planning and development into moderate and high hazard drainages;
- attempting to promote silviculture treatments which facilitate the creation of age class, species composition, and stand density mosaics across the landscape.

** pheromone baits will be utilized in a manner consistent with the Merritt Forest District's "Insect Behaviour Modifying Treatments Policy".

Other

Catastrophic Amendment Process

Due to the IBM epidemic in the southern portion of the TSA it has become apparent that heavily infested watersheds/drainages are receiving an accelerated rate of cut either to control the beetle population within the localized area, or simply to salvage the stand to reduce economic loss. For these instances the district is developing a catastrophic amendment process which would involve discussions between the licensee, MOELP and the Ministry of Forests prior to the submission of the amendment. The amendment process was felt to be prudent due to the increased risk to other resource values when extensively modifying the watershed/drainage.

The catastrophic amendment process would be triggered if a licensee was planning salvage harvest within a watershed or large drainage in which the Equivalent Clearcut Area (ECA) levels were going to exceed 30%. Thirty percent is an approximate benchmark and may be raised or lowered depending on the sensitivity of the watershed and other resource values. The intent is for all parties to provide input into planning with the objective of preserving future options within drainages while understanding landscape implications of accelerated harvest.

Currently the SBFEP is not planning on submitting a catastrophic amendment. However, if there is a large increase in the beetle population following subsequent years flights, we may find it necessary to proceed with this process.

Spruce Bark Beetle

Occurrence

The spruce bark beetle (IBS) can have similar impacts on forest resources, timber supply and wood quality as described above with the mountain pine beetle. However, due to the distribution and occurrence of spruce stands within the TSA, the potential for impact is much lower than compared to IBM. During earlier planning periods, IBS was present and had a moderate impact on forest resources within Arrastra Creek, Champion Creek, Copper Creek, Railroad Creek, Rabbitt Mountain and July Creek charts. Currently, the populations have declined and are at or below endemic levels. The SBFEP is not aware of any populations or pockets of infestation and therefore have no immediate plans for harvest.

Management Objectives

The management objectives for IBS mimic the objectives as described for IBM.

As stated earlier, IBS populations are currently at endemic or near endemic levels and it is anticipated that these levels will be maintained throughout the term of the plan. It is anticipated that minor amounts of IBS will occur during the term of the plan but with timely information from aerial overviews and ground detection and prompt action by the SBFEP, the beetle populations should be contained to small areas.

Strategies

Strategies to be employed by the SBFEP will be in a manner consistent with the 'General Management Strategies' as described in the 'Bark Beetle Management Guidebook'. While all six management strategies may be employed across our chart areas in varying degrees, we expect that 'Suppression' and 'Maintain Low' will continue to be our two main strategies.

Tactics

The tactics for IBS closely mimic the tactics as described for IBM.

Trap trees, often used in conjunction with harvesting or single tree treatments to control IBS will be utilized in a manner consistent with the Merritt Forest District's 'Insect Behaviour Modifying Treatments Policy'. In an effort to decrease host material on site following harvest, all spruce chunks greater than 20 centimeters diameter and less than two years downed will be skidded to the landing for disposal. However, if the pre-harvest spruce component is <10% and risk to adjacent stands is low, this material may stay on site to benefit other values (i.e. coarse woody debris (CWD).

Douglas-fir Bark Beetle (IBD)

Occurrence

As stated earlier, bark beetles in general can have a severe impact on forest resources, timber supply and wood quality. However, due to the distribution and occurrence of Douglas-fir stands within the TSA the potential for impact is much lower than impacts as compared to IBM. Currently, the populations have declined and are at or below endemic levels with the exception of the Matthew Creek chart. Due to the 1998 wildfire and thus stressed timber, this area has become more susceptible to IBD. Probing in 2000 has indicated approximately 1,000 plus affected trees. Harvesting and trap trees will be used to control this infestation. The SBFEP is not aware of any other significant populations or pockets of infestation and therefore have no immediate plans for harvest.

Management Objectives, Strategies and tactics closely resemble those of IBS.

In an effort to decrease host material on site following harvest, all Douglas-fir chunks greater than 20 centimeters diameter and less than two years downed will be skidded to the landing for disposal. However, if the pre-harvest Douglas-fir component is <10% and risk to adjacent stands is low this material may stay on site to benefit other values (i.e. CWD).

Root Diseases

Occurrence

Armillaria ostoyae and *Phellinus weirii* are found over the majority of the operating areas and are the two root diseases of concern. These diseases are having varying impacts on the stands depending on the condition of the stand and the level of the innoculum. The main impact of these root diseases is the effect it is having on the productivity of the stands by reducing tree growth and the outright mortality of existing and future stands. Although these root diseases occur over a wide range of biogeoclimatic zones it is documented that their occurrence and impact is much greater in the interior Douglas-fir types. The extent of the impact is not quantified as there is a lack of available data dealing with this disease in the SBFEP chart areas. However, it should be noted that the SBFEP view root disease as a significant forest health issue.

Management Objectives

The goal of the SBFEP is to reduce the impact that root pathogens are having on stands in the operating areas and to increase the productivity of these sites. At present this is done at the stand level with the intent of ensuring silviculture obligations and future stand objectives are accomplished.

Strategies

All four strategies referred to in the 'Root Disease Management Guidebook' may be used in the term of this plan but innoculum removal and alternate species selection will be the two main strategies utilized.

Tactics

Tactics utilized will be consistent with the 'Root Disease Management Guidebook' and the District Manager's policy on Forest Health Evaluation for Root Diseases. Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem Classification maps will be used to help identify high risk ecosystems prior to the commencement of field work. Treatment options will be identified in the Silviculture Prescription (SP) and site specific tactics will be developed depending on the site characteristics, severity and distribution of the infestation as well as other resource values within the area.

Lodgepole Pine Dwarf Mistletoe

Occurrence

Lodgepole pine dwarf mistletoe is common throughout the SBFEP operating area. Dwarf mistletoe reduces tree growth and in severe cases may cause mortality. Dwarf mistletoe is presently and will continue to impact the stands over the term of this plan.

Management Objectives

The management objective when dealing with lodgepole pine dwarf mistletoe is to reduce the rate of spread and intensity within regenerating stands.

Strategies

In areas where dwarf mistletoe has been identified and lodgepole pine will be a managed species, cutblocks will be designed to reduce the infection and rate of spread on regenerating stands.

Tactics

On all cutblocks in our operating area, all lodgepole pine trees greater than 30 centimeters in height will be eradicated post harvest in order to remove the organism from originating within the stand (unless exempted in the silviculture prescription). Wherever possible, cutblock configuration will attempt to maximize cutblock area while minimizing edge effect, roads and non-susceptible timber types will be used as boundaries and where opportunities permit, alternate species may be considered for planting along the fringes of infected block perimeters.

During survey monitoring (including stocking and free-growing surveys) the fringe of the block will not be considered a separate stratum due to the potential for mistletoe infection.

Western Gall Rust

Occurrence

Western gall rust infestations are located throughout the district and have the potential to be present on the majority of our regenerating pine stands within our operating area. This disease can reduce tree growth and cause mortality in regenerating pine stands. Presently, the SBFEP are not aware of any plantations within our operating area currently being significantly affected by this disease. Since western gall rust is cyclical in nature there is a moderate likelihood it will be expressed in the term of this plan.

Management Objectives, Strategies and Tactics

The goal of the SBFEP is to reduce the risk of western gall rust having an impact on regenerating stands. This may be accomplished by managing regenerating high risk stands to higher stocking levels in anticipation of stem mortality and reforesting with a species mix where ecologically suitable and prudent to do so. Further tactics for western gall rust will be consistent with the 'Pine Stem Rust Management Guidebook'.

Western Spruce Budworm

Occurrence

Western spruce budworm impacts appear to be most severe in uneven aged stands. It has been active in the past and has a moderate impact in the Swakum Mountain chart. Impacts of this pest are reduced tree growth and mortality. Currently, impacts in this

chart are low and the budworm population has tapered off. At present we are not active in this chart but will continue to monitor budworm populations over the term of this plan and throughout our operating areas.

Management Objectives

The objective for management of the western spruce budworm is to reduce potential losses as a result of infestation.

Strategies

Western spruce budworm outbreaks will be closely monitored in conjunction with the district at quarterly Forest Health Unit Strategy meetings. Strategies for western spruce budworm will be consistent with the 'Defoliator Management Guidebook'. Some of these strategies include; stand structure manipulation, promotion of species mix and conversion to alternate species.

Tactics

Hazard maps available through the district office will be used in assessing risk to stands within our operating area. If there is an outbreak of budworm during the term of this plan tactics such as biological controls as well as sanitation/salvage harvest techniques will be implemented. By working closely with the district at Forest Health Unit Strategy meetings we can quickly pinpoint where outbreaks are occurring and in doing so can initiate development for control.

Windthrow

Occurrence

Windthrow is present throughout the operating area and usually occurs in small patches along road edges and block boundaries. However, it may occur in managed stands after a partial cutting or if reserve stems are prescribed. If it occurs it is usually expressed within the first five years following harvest. Rarely does it occur as a catastrophic event encompassing a large area (although this has been known to happen). If windthrow is left untreated, unsalvaged losses and fire hazard increases and it may become host material for other forest health pests. The SBFEP is not aware of any windthrow within the operating area that would require a salvage treatment.

Management Objectives, Strategies and Tactics

The objective for management of windthrow is to reduce the occurrence and impact as well as to harvest promptly, if practical and feasible. Potential for windthrow is reduced by block configuration, boundary location, and foresight at the planning and silviculture prescription stages. The tactics employed should address windthrow by analyzing stand, soil, topographic and meteorological characteristics.

3.2 Water

Issues

Resource protection issues associated with water are centered on preservation of water quality for the various areas of operation proposed in this plan.

General Measures to Protect

The SBFEP will time its harvest and road construction operations in an effort to minimize impacts on sensitive soils. It will construct and deactivate roads in a manner that minimizes impact on natural drainage patterns. In stream work operations will be limited to appropriate work windows and approved variances. It will use appropriate harvesting methods on sites with sensitive soils.

In all SBFEP operations, regardless of the relative water values, the maintenance of water quality will be a prime objective. Factors considered include, but are not limited to; riparian management area, basal area retention, stream bank stability and water quantity.

Where required, watershed assessments provide guidance to planning development in the Merritt Forest District (see Watershed Assessment section below).

Water Quality Objectives

There are currently no specific quantitative water quality objectives for the Merritt TSA. However, the SBFEP chart areas do have the potential to impact known licensed domestic water supply intakes. The SBFEP will be consistent with the direction as provided in section 23 of the *Timber Harvesting Practices Regulations.*

Watershed Assessments

Issues and Measures to Protect

As a result of the 1996 TSA Interior Watershed Assessment Procedure (IWAP) conducted by the Merritt Forest District, several watersheds were red flagged as requiring further study. In the 1998 FDP the SBFEP committed to completing Channel Assessments in the following basins (see table).

During the fall of 1998 the SBFEP contracted Klohn-Crippen to complete the Channel Assessments. Once the Channel Assessments were complete, the SBFEP jointly developed an action plan with the districts Watershed Restoration Specialist. Recommendations are described below:

Basin Name	Sub Basin	Recommendations and Actions
Copper Creek	Lower Copper Creek (114)	**Report Indicated:** R1 – fish/stream channel rehabilitation (level 2 assessment). R4 – landslide rehabilitation assessment. R6 – detailed channel assessment and prescriptions. **SBFEP Actions:** R1 – this reach was field visited by the district's Watershed Restoration Specialist who at that time determined that no further actions were warranted for this reach. R4 – the landslide was assessed by a regional specialist who indicated that the slide did not warrant further assessment or rehabilitation. R6 – the district Watershed Restoration Specialist determined that further assessments and associated prescriptions were not warranted at this time. However, consideration should be given to stream monitoring over time. The SBFEP is aware that the Copper Creek mainstem is sensitive due to its stream characteristics. Development planning and road maintenance will take this into consideration.
Copper Creek	Unnamed (115)	No actions required.
Copper Creek	Garrison Lakes Creek (116)	**Report Indicated**: Road and hill-slope restoration potential. **SBFEP Actions**: The restoration area is within Weyerhaeuser's operating area and the information has been passed on to Weyerhaeuser through IWAP meetings.
Copper Creek	Copper Ck. Head-waters (117)	No actions required.
Copper Creek	Unnamed (118)	**Report Indicated:** Road and hill-slope restoration potential. **SBFEP Actions:** Works have been completed by SBFEP.
Pimainus Creek	N/A	No actions required.
Skuhun Creek above Skuhost Creek	N/A	No actions required.
Skuhun Creek above Skuhost Creek	Skuhun	No actions required.
Skuhost	N/A	No actions required.
Skuhost	Skuhost Ck. East Fork	No actions required.
Skuhost	Unnamed West Tributary.	No actions required.
Siwash and Galena Confluence	General area	**Report Indicated:** Recommend hill-slope, road and channel rehabilitation assessments. **SBFEP Actions**: The area of concern is predominantly within Weyerhaeuser's operating area and the information has been passed on to Weyerhaeuser through IWAP meetings.

July Creek	NA	**Report Indicated:** Restoration Site #1 – culvert replacement - road trail deactivation - stream stabilization Restoration Site #2 – road deactivation prescription Restoration Site #3 – bridge replacement/removal **SBFEP Actions:** Restoration Site #1 – culvert replacement – culvert is functioning and will be monitored in yearly maintenance. – road trail deactivation – will be addressed through a detailed deactivation prescription in 2001. – stream stabilization – through discussions with the district's Watershed Restoration Specialist it is the understanding of the SBFEP that this area is being assessed by Tolko. Restoration Site #2 – road deactivation prescriptions – deactivation has been completed. Restoration Site #3 – bridge replacement/removal – bridge has been removed.

3.3 Fisheries

Issues

Although no fish streams or lakes have been made known under the *Forest Practices Code of BC Act*, there is known fish presence through assessments undertaken by the SBFEP. Other direction is expected from MELP and DFO on a site specific basis through referral. These sources of known fish presence will be addressed in SBFEP development on a site specific basis.

Measures to Protect

Where proposed development involves in-stream work on fish-bearing streams, the objective of the SBFEP/licensee will be to conduct this work within the specified work windows and/or associated variance. All works will be conducted in accordance with the *Fisheries Act*, *FPC of B.C. Act*, District Manager letter of May 21, 1997, and DM policy letter of October 10, 1997. Where crossings concern anadromous streams the site plan/variance request will be forwarded to DFO as the primary respondent

Measures to protect the fisheries resource are also outlined in section 3.2 and 3.4 of this document.

3.4 Riparian Management

Issues

Management objectives within riparian zones at the operational level are intended to maintain the health and integrity of the riparian zone. Prescribed management at the stand level is directly linked to the size of the water body and the sensitivity of the riparian feature.

During the Lakes Classification LRUP project the District Manager designated lake classes and established 'Lake Shore Management Zones' on most lakes three hectares or larger. Development within these areas will be consistent with the guidelines as stated in the 'Lake Classification and Lakeshore Management Guidebook: Kamloops Forest Region September 1996' and the District Manager instruction letter dated August 4, 1998.

General Objectives for Riparian Management Zones, Including the Range of Basal Area Retention by Riparian Class

Riparian areas occur next to the banks of streams, wetlands and lakes and include both the area dominated by continuous high moisture content and the adjacent upland vegetation that exerts an influence on it. Riparian ecosystems contain many of the highest value non-timber resources in the natural forest. Biologically diverse, these areas maintain ecological linkages throughout the forest landscape, connecting hillsides to streams and upper headwaters to lower valley bottoms.

By virtue of its high productivity, diversity, continuity, and critical contributions to aquatic ecosystems, riparian habitat provides a rich and vital resource to fish. Riparian habitat performs many functions that are essential to fish survival and productivity, and it is critical in supporting suitable in-stream conditions necessary for the conservation of salmon stocks and trout species. Vegetation in riparian areas shade streams maintaining cool temperatures needed by most fish. Plant roots stabalize stream banks and control erosion and sedimentation, and vegetation creates overhanging cover for fish. Riparian habitat contributes leaves, twigs, and insects to streams, thereby providing basic food and nutrients that support fish and aquatic wildlife. Large trees that fall into streams create pools, riffles, backwater, small dams, and off channel habitat that are necessary to fish for cover, spawning, rearing, and protection from predators. Pools help maintain riffles where gravel essential for spawning accumulates. Riparian vegetation, litter layers, and soils filter incoming sediments and pollutants thereby assisting in the maintenance of high water quality needed for healthy fish populations. Riparian habitat moderates stream volumes reducing peak flows during flooding periods and by storing and slowly releasing water into streams during low flows.

The riparian management area consists of a riparian management zone and, where required by regulation, a riparian reserve zone. The width of these zones are determined by the attributes of the streams, lakes and wetlands.

Where a riparian management area has both a riparian reserve zone and a riparian management zone the objectives within the riparian management zone are to:

- reduce the risk of windthrow to vegetation retained in the riparian reserve zone;
- retain important wildlife attributes including wildlife trees, large trees, hiding and resting cover, nesting sites, structural diversity, coarse woody debris, and food sources characteristic of natural riparian ecosystems.

Where a riparian management area has only a riparian management zone the objectives within the riparian management zone are to:

- retain sufficient vegetation along streams to provide shade, reduce band microclimate changes, maintain natural channel and bank stability and maintain important attributes for wildlife;

- retain key wildlife habitat attributes characteristic of natural riparian ecosystems adjacent to wetlands and lakes.

NOTE: The above stated objectives are intended to maintain the integrity of the stream

as well as maintain biodiversity, and wildlife values. These objectives may vary at the stand level but the intent of the objectives over all riparian management areas within the scope of the FDP will be adhered to.

There are two circumstances within the SBFEP's operating areas that warrant special consideration when prescribing management activities within riparian management areas:

- a number of streams within the Nicola River watershed have been designated as "temperature sensitive" as per the MOF and MOELP letter dated January 27, 2000. The streams indicated within this designation, S4 streams in all areas of operation, and all direct tributaries to the above will be managed to accommodate shade in efforts to maintain stream temperature.

- due to the harvest of mountain pine beetle the SBFEP may encounter watersheds where the equivalent clearcut area (ECA) will exceed 30%. Protection of water quality, maintenance of structural diversity and locations of wildlife corridors are of high importance. Thirty percent ECA is a benchmark number and may be raised or lowered depending on the sensitivity of the watershed and other resource values.

The above areas that warrant special consideration will be managed to achieve a higher than average basal area retention within the riparian management zone. It should be noted that other localized areas not mentioned above may also warrant this special consideration.

Measures to Protect

In order to meet riparian objectives the following ranges for basal area retention are proposed: riparian classes of similar retention levels are grouped by category. The range of basal area retention is directly associated with the value of the riparian class and windthrow hazard.

Basal Area Retention Targets Within RMZ's
(% of pre-harvest levels)

Category	Riparian Class	Target BA Retention (%)	Range of BA retention (%)	Rational for Target BA Retention
A	S1,S2,S3 W1,W2,W5 *L1,L2	30-80	0-100	High windthrow hazard / higher levels of retention Low windthrow hazard / lower levels of retention
B	S4 S5**,S6**	90-100	0-100	As these streams warrant special consideration (as per DFO recommendations), removal of stems is not generally accepted. However, as described below, there may be other dictating factors that warrant removal. Any deviation from the above retention levels as stated in Category B will be referred to DFO for review and comment. The 10% variation is to allow for removal of stems that are not windfirm.
C	S5 W3,*L3	10-50	0-100	High windthrow hazard / lower levels of retention Low windthrow hazard / higher levels of retention
D	S6 W4,L4	0-30	0-100	High windthrow hazard / lower levels of retention Low windthrow hazard / higher levels of retention

* Lakes classified by the District Manager will follow the guidelines as stated in the 'Lake Classification and Lakeshore Management Guidebook: Kamloops Forest Region September 1996'. The wide range of retention levels (Target BA Retention) within Category C and D is to reflect areas that warrant special consideration (temperature sensitivity, watersheds deemed to be sensitive, etc.)

** S5 and S6 streams that are direct tributaries to fish streams.

S5&S6 streams (Category C and D) will generally follow Best Management Practices as set out in the Riparian Management Area Guidebook.

Basal area retention levels will be prescribed for the portion of the RMZ that is encompassed by the block. If a RMZ is wholly encompassed within a block boundary, the SBFEP will attempt to manage to the target basal area retention levels. If the block boundary is located a distance away from the riparian feature, but still within a portion of the RMZ, the SBFEP will manage to the range of basal area retention levels.

As stated above, measures prescribed for riparian management zones in the Nicola River watershed and areas where ECA levels are exceeding the 30% mark will be managed to the higher end of the retention levels where possible and practical to do so (in these cases windthrow and forest health factors may not be a dictating force).

It is the intent of the SBFEP to manage all riparian classes to ensure that the stated objectives are achieved. However, other factors such as terrain, stand type, forest health, harvesting method, operating constraints and the sensitivity of the water body must also be considered. The above is a wide range of retention levels to accommodate the above circumstances.

If there is a perceived risk to the integrity of a riparian management area and associated riparian feature, the licensee will seek guidance from MOELP and will incorporate appropriate recommendations into the SP.

Stream Crossings

The *Fisheries Act* and Canada's policy for the Management of Fish Habitat requires that all crossings of fish streams be fish passable and that there is no net loss of fish habitat. Presently, the working draft of the 'Stream Crossing Guidebook' is under review by MOF and DFO and is expected to undergo revision. Pending release of this guidebook (and in keeping with DFO's requests) the SBFEP will adhere to the following:

- All proposed bridges/culverts across **anadromous** fish bearing streams (S1-S4) are to be referred to DFO for review and comment.

- All proposed bridges/culverts on direct tributaries to **anadromous** fish bearing streams that are within 200 meters of a fish stream are to be referred to DFO for review and comment.

If referring stream crossing proposals to DFO or MOELP for review, the SBFEP will ensure that both Site Data and a Fish Habitat Protection Plan as outlined in the working draft 'Stream Crossing Guidebook' (97/98) are completed and enclosed.

Other

The following are circumstances which warrant referral to DFO:

- Events such as landslides, debris torrents, road failures, etc. and remedial work which may impact on fish habitat.

- Proposed works which would result in the harmful alteration of fish habitat for which an authorization under section 35 of the *Fisheries Act* would be required and/or the deposit of deleterious substances into fish-bearing waters.

3.5 Wildlife

Issues

The mechanisms for management of Identified Wildlife under the *FPC of BC Act* are wildlife habitat areas, general wildlife measures and higher level plan recommendations. Currently, the SBFEP operating areas have no such mechanism for management. However, the MOELP has made available to the program an information package detailing species at risk and proposed strategies to consider for incorporation into the prescriptive process. The SBFEP is committed to working with the 'Identified Wildlife Management Strategy', the information as provided by MOELP, and applying these strategies and management measures in their planning areas where appropriate. In many instances this will involve a consultative process with MOELP.

Grizzly bears within the North Cascades are currently near extirpated levels (close to extinction). MOELP decided that in order to revive the grizzly population that a recovery plan was required. Currently there is a 'North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan' that is in the developmental phases and is greater in scope than just the Merritt TSA. Therefore, in the interim, the MOELP coupled with the affected licensees within the district have developed the 'Guiding Principles for Grizzly Bear Habitat Protection for Forest Development Plans and Silviculture Prescription Planning'. The SBFEP is one of the affected licensees and as such, is committed to working with MOELP and the other licensees in applying these guidelines. These guidelines will be subject to higher level plans and are expected to be integrated with the 'North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan' once completed and adopted by the Merritt Forest District.

Objectives for Known Ungulate Winter Ranges

The objective for managing mule deer winter range is to maintain and enhance forage and habitat requirements within their critical winter range as identified by the status maps. In doing so, management strategies will focus on maintaining canopy closure by dispersing the harvest of timber throughout the winter range area, and by spreading it out evenly over the rotation in a number of passes.

* Due to forest health factors this may not be achievable on all managed areas (i.e. IBM in the Wolfe-Belgie chart)

Measures To Protect

The SBFEP commits to managing for mule deer in accordance with the 'Kamloops Forest Region – Integrated Resource Management Timber Harvesting Guidelines and the Ungulate Winter Range Strategy for the Merritt TSA' (October 13, 1998). Mule deer winter range management will be conducted in areas identified on the 1998 mule deer winter range status maps. Areas inside the status maps which do not contain the attributes of mule deer winter range will be managed accordingly (this will only occur after consultation with MOELP). Conversely, areas outside of the status maps will be managed for mule deer winter range if the suitable site attributes are confirmed to exist after field verification. The SBFEP recognizes there may be a need to consult with MOELP during operational plan development.

In keeping with the district's guidelines for grizzly bear management the SBFEP is proposing to restrict access in chart areas affected by this policy. These areas include Copper Creek (West), Railroad/Carry Creek, Champion and Arrastra creeks. Discussions regarding consultation and access management are ongoing and will be reflected in future plans or possible amendments to this plan.

3.6 Recreation

Issues

Established recreation sites and trails in the area under the plan are identified in section 2 of this plan. The SBFEP recognizes that there are other recreation sites and trails in addition to this designation that warrant consideration in the planning process.

Measures to Protect

The district SBFEP staff will work with the district recreation staff to maintain or enhance the recreation resource and will recognize all recreational values.

In general, recreation sites will be reserved from harvesting except where harvesting assists the recreation staff in achieving their goals, or a catastrophic event such as wildfire and/or disease/pest infestation dictates salvage or sanitation logging in order to maintain overall forest health.

3.7 Botanical Forest Products

Issues

First Nations and other interest groups are known to collect mushrooms, roots, berries, herbs and bark in select areas throughout the TSA. The SBFEP FDP has been made available to First Nations and public for review, input and consultation.(see referral Part 1). Consultation through ministry efforts has provided insight into potential for plant harvest and use.

Measures to Protect

SBFEP, with the assistance of interested parties (as identified in the FDP review process), will work to minimize impacts to these resources.

3.8 Range

Issues

Over the majority of the SBFEP's operating areas the Ministry of Forests has issued both forest licenses and grazing licenses to separate parties over the same land base. In order to ensure both licenses are managed to minimize potential conflict, foresight and mutual communication must occur during all stages of forest management. The following will be used as guidelines and general objectives when dealing with range issues:

Measures to Protect

Communication

The SBFEP will keep in contact with the range tenure holder(s) to discuss forest development, harvesting and reforestation activities. This process will be accomplished through referrals, field trips, and informal day to day discussions of plans and activities. Where possible, activities will be co-ordinated to reduce conflicts. Where unforeseen conflicts arise, resolution will be achieved through discussion with the range tenure holder(s).

Existing Range Development

Range improvements near logging activities will be protected or properly repaired if damaged as a result of harvesting or development. The location of existing range improvements shall be determined through discussions with the range tenure holder(s). When damage is expected, the season and length of time when the improvement may be inoperable shall be determined with the range tenure holder(s).

Non Structural Range Values

The SBFEP will avoid damage wherever possible to non-structural range values such as natural dryland meadows. If damage occurs, the non-structural range values will be properly rehabilitated as soon as practical following logging.

Access

Access to stock trails and stock watering sites shall not be impeded. Undesired human access development will be minimized. Road deactivation will be discussed with range tenure holder(s). Potential conflict sites will be resolved with range tenure holder(s) and documented in the FDP or SP.

Cutblock Design

The range tenure holder(s) will be referred planned development through the FDP processes. The SBFEP will attempt to address concerns regarding design as they arise.

Forage Availability

If concerns arise, the SBFEP will discuss the issue with the range tenure holder(s) in attempt for resolution.

Livestock Drift

Situations which cause livestock drift shall be discussed with the range tenure holder(s) prior to logging. Conflict locations will be identified in the FDP or the SP and the resolutions stated. All cost responsibilities will be agreed to and identified.

Tree Seedling Protection

Situations which may result in livestock damage to tree seedlings will be attempted to be resolved with the range tenure holder(s) prior to logging. Conflict locations must be identified in the FDP or the SP and the resolutions stated. All cost responsibilities will be agreed to and identified.

Other Silviculture Activities

Where activities damage or reduce availability of forage (thinning, burning, herbiciding), the location and timing will be discussed with the range tenure holder(s).

Grass Seeding

The SBFEP re-vegetates recently disturbed road right-of-way disturbances, landings and other disturbed areas (i.e. bladed skid roads) to prevent erosion and the invasion of noxious weeds as soon as possible upon completion of harvest. This is usually accomplished with a suitable mix of grass and legume species.

The SBFEP does not have a seeding program to enhance forage or its availability. If concerns arise, the SBFEP will discuss the issue with the range tenure holder(s) in attempt for resolution.

Fencing Construction

Where responsible for the establishment of fencing along cutblock boundaries or within blocks and/or roads we will ensure that trees which are used for fencing anchors are bucked off at the bole, so as to ensure that the fence will not be up-rooted if the trees blow over.

Noxious Weed Control

Most temporary roads, landings, and bladed skid roads will be ripped and/or re-contoured and re-vegetated with grass mix after harvesting. As well, all cuts and fills on

main access roads will be seeded with grass mix. Areas identified as having a potential to be invaded by noxious weeds will be treated to produce a vegetative cover capable of competing with those weeds promptly after harvesting. The timber sale licensee and ministry compliance staff shall advise logging truck drivers and other heavy equipment operators of the necessity to ensure that the undercarriage of their vehicle or equipment be free of noxious weeds when leaving or returning to a site. Also, whenever possible, cutblocks and access roads will be planned and constructed so as to avoid relatively large patches of noxious weeds, thereby lessening the likelihood of their spread.

3.9 Biological Diversity

Landscape level objectives have not been finalized for the Merritt Forest District. Until this information becomes available, biodiversity objectives will for the most part be addressed at the stand level. Stand level management of coarse woody debris, riparian and wildlife tree retention will be considered during the development of each TSL. In general and where possible and appropriate, wind firm Douglas-fir veterans and recruitment trees, ponderosa pine veterans and deciduous species will continue to be reserved as leave trees. Additionally, where feller bunchers are utilized and suitable stems are available then stubs may be created.

Following are specific stand/landscape level objectives which aid in maintaining and enhancing biodiversity as well as water quality.

Measures to Protect

3.9.1 General Objectives Respecting Target Levels of Coarse Woody Debris Retention

Coarse woody debris (CWD) is an important component of forests and is linked to biodiversity and ecosystem processes. Long term management of this resource is vital to maintain ecosystem integrity. For the purposes of this section, CWD will be defined as material greater than 7.5 cm in diameter, in all stages of decay and consists of above ground logs, stumps, exposed roots and large fallen branches. In most cases, the target for CWD retention will be to maintain levels of CWD consistent with the pre-harvest stand levels; higher levels of CWD will be maintained in those stands where pre-harvest levels are greater, and lower levels will be maintained in those stands where pre-harvest levels are lower. In areas where CWD levels are extremely low (i.e. not as per surrounding landscape) an effort will be made to enhance CWD levels if deemed appropriate.

The following general objectives respecting CWD management are designed to meet this target with the intent of minimizing the impact on the environment and the economy, while minimizing the risk to other forest resources. The SBFEP will apply the *Regional Strategy for CWD Management (August 1999)* where appropriate. The general objectives are as follows:

- maintain as much CWD as possible using non-merchantable sources;

- wherever possible CWD will be retained throughout the block as opposed to large piles on landing sites;
- ensure that the composition and arrangement of CWD will not result in an unacceptable risk of wildlife or pest and pathogen outbreaks;
- harmonize the retention of CWD with all other silviculture objectives;
- retention efforts will be focused on larger piece sizes to ensure longevity;
- where possible, maintenance of post harvest stand structure will be designed to ensure long term CWD recruitment (through single tree reserves, wildlife tree patch designation, cull trees and retention of riparian vegetation);
- in recognition of the importance of riparian areas, greater emphasis will be placed on maintaining CWD in and around these areas;
- maintain variability of the levels of CWD at the landscape level.

3.9.2 Wildlife Tree Patch Retention

It is preferable to develop Wildlife Tree Patches (WTP's) on a landscape level. By establishing WTPs at this level, the SBFEP ensures that the best WTP is chosen rather that what may be available at the stand level. The goal is to ensure that needs of wildlife are met in the best habitat areas. This is best accomplished prior to harvest patterns and utilizing the larger land base. This will be done in consultation with MOELP.

In 1997/98, the SBFEP initiated a strategy of landscape level WTP creation. This was done after discussing and agreeing on the process with the MOELP. The intention was to select the best WTP sites within the charts based upon wildlife needs. The process involved selecting approximately 50 percent of the required WTP percentage (as required under district policy) for each biogeoclimatic zone by chart area. The remainder or other 50 percent of the WTP is to be incorporated in riparian reserve zones and other constrained areas containing favorable attributes. These areas will then be integrated during the SP process.

It should be noted that at present, the fifty percent criteria was exceeded and as many suitable WTP areas as possible were recommended in each chart. The areas selected were ranked according to importance to wildlife. As such, not all areas selected will necessarily be utilized. Discussions with MOELP are still required in order to finalize which patches will be utilized. This information is still in draft format and will not be included in this plan.

Landscape Level WTPs have been completed for the following charts: Champion Creek, Rabbit Mountain, Railroad Creek, Whipsaw Creek and Wolfe-Belgie north. The intent is to complete the selection of landscape level WTPs for all charts within the FDP.

Due to the IBM epidemic the SBFEP has been concentrating planning and harvesting efforts in the southern portion of the district and has not been able to finalize this

strategy. Once the IBM is addressed it is our hope to finalize and incorporate the data in future plans. If planning permits, the SBFEP will attempt to incorporate these landscape level patches into current SP's.

Until this strategy is finalized between the SBFEP and MOELP, the SBFEP will be consistent with the District Manager policy letter re: 'Wildlife Tree Patch Retention' dated June 14, 1996 (Updated December 23, 1997).

Except as above, WTP selection will occur at the SP level and be guided by the following strategies:

- The maximum distance between wildlife trees or WTP's will be less than 500 meters unless rationalized in the SP.
- WTP's will be located to protect specific stems or attributes of significance to wildlife (e.g. large trees for the site, broken top, evidence of decay, loose bark) or be representative of the stand being harvested in the absence of stems with such features.
- Less common timber types in the general area of the prescription will have higher representation in WTP's.
- If possible, WTP patches will be located and designed to minimize damage from wind and insects thus reduce the pressure for salvage
- Wildlife trees either singly or in patches will not be cut except for timber health or worker safety concerns, and will remain on site as coarse woody debris unless their removal is required for timber health concerns.
- No roads or trails will be built in WTP's unless there is no practical alternative.

3.9.3 Proposed Forest Connectivity Corridors

MOELP has developed draft connectivity corridors for a number of our chart areas. These connectivity corridors have been incorporated into the area under our plan. Harvesting will not occur in these areas without prior consultation with MOELP.

3.10 Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Sites

For the purpose of this plan cultural heritage resource has been divided into two groups: archaeological and potential aboriginal rights.

Archaeological Resource Issues

Archaeological heritage resources are protected under the *Heritage Conservation Act.* They include sites indicating human occupation, habitation or utilization of land resources prior to 1846.

Aboriginal Rights Issues

Potential for aboriginal right is assessed primarily through referral and consultation processes, assessments and surveys.

Measures to Protect Cultural Heritage Resources

SBFEP's objective is to avoid disturbing archaeological sites by working with First Nations to identify where recce or assessment work may be required in advance of forest development. The FDP has been referred to all appropriate bands for review and comment. Consultation has brought information via the ministry. Known, recorded archaeological sites are not shown on the FDP maps in order to protect the integrity of those sites. Where SBFEP development is proposed in the vicinity of an archaeological site, then measures to protect the site are incorporated in road layout and design and SP preparation (at times an alteration permit may be required).

The SBFEP is committed to recognizing the importance of archaeological and historical sites for the area under the plan. As information becomes known, it will be documented, and information will be forwarded to the appropriate agency.

Please refer to section 1.5 (Referral Summary) and section 4.1 (Harvest Summary Table) to view more specific detail with regards to First Nations comments and assessment commitments.

3.11 Fire Hazard and Prevention

Occurrence

Historically the occurrence of a catastrophic wildfire is rare, although the district experienced an approximately 8,000 hectare wildfire in the vicinity of the Tulameen Valley in the late summer of 1998. This resulted in an extensive harvesting and reclamation program which is currently near completion. Silviculture activities are still to be completed over the majority of the area.

The SBFEP Matthew chart was significantly impacted by this fire resulting in approximately 600 plus hectares affected (intensity varied from slight spotting to stand replacing). Approximately one half of this area was salvage harvested. The remaining area will be observed over the next few years for potential salvage opportunities although, the majority of this is deemed inoperable or has been retained to allow for natural succession.

MOELP has reviewed the area of the wildfire and developed management objectives (Management Objectives for Lawless Creek Wildfire). It was determined that approximately 24,700 hectares would be considered a sensitive area in which these guidelines should be applied. This area consists of the 8,000 hectare wildfire with the remaining area mostly being comprised of managed forest land. The intent of the delineated area is to minimize any further development within the *sensitive area**, thereby allowing hydrologic, soil stabilization, wildlife and biodiversity values to recover. These guidelines would apply to the SBFEP's Matthew Creek and the northern third of

the Rabbitt Mountain chart. Any future development within this *sensitive area** will reflect these management objectives. This would most likely occur as a consultative process between MOELP and the SBFEP. It should be noted that other than our presently approved category A blocks and potentially minor amounts of salvage, the SBFEP have no large scale development plans for this area in the near future.

Please note that the current objectives recognize approval for harvest of presently approved category A and potential salvage cutblocks. These will not be developed in isolation of the aforementioned objectives.

Management Objectives, Strategies and Tactics

The SBFEP's main management objective is to decrease the risk of a wildfire through fire prevention and fuel management techniques.

All SBFEP registrants will be formally advised of the requirements of the 'Forest Fire Prevention and 'Suppression Regulations'. All operations will be conducted in accordance with 'Forest Fire Prevention and Suppression Regulations'.

Each SBFEP licensee with operations employing more than four persons, that will have active operations, for more than 30 days during the fire season (April 1 – October 31), is required to submit to the Merritt Fire Zone a 'Fire Preparedness Plan' as part of their license document. Enforcement will be carried out by the district compliance and enforcement team.

Landings will be constructed, piled, and prepared for burning by the license holder as per the *FPC of BC Act* and SP. In order to reduce potentially negative impacts on standing timber during landing disposal, wherever possible all landings will be located on flat ground sufficiently removed from standing timber, (recommended minimum distance is 20 metres) to reduce scorching and possible insect damage. Where possible, piles of waste material will not be pushed over embankments or mixed with noncombustible material. The disposal of landing debris, ripping, spreading of unburned material, and grass seeding of landings will be done by the SBFEP (license holders of UTSL's sold under the Chief Forester's uplift will be responsible for their landing management). In most cases, if harvesting is completed by July 31, forest debris will be disposed of by December 31 of the same year. If harvesting is completed after July 31, forest debris will be disposed of by December 31 of the following year, unless disposal is required for operational needs or public safety. By signing this plan, the District Manager is authorizing this practice pursuant to section 19(3) of the *THPR* as usually landings will not have cured sufficiently to allow for burning if harvest has not been completed by July 31. All burned landings that are not ripped and spread will be infrared scanned in the spring to detect hangover fires.

* *Sensitive Area* - the definition of sensitive area is consistent with the "Management Objectives For Lawless Creek Wildfire" and has no link to Sensitive Area as described in the *Forest Practices Code of B.C Act* (Part 2 section 5).

Fuel Management

SBFEP operating areas are distributed throughout three main fuel types based on the 'Canadian Forest Fire Behaviour' rating system. Fuel measured below is deemed (natural):

C-7 fuel type pre-harvest
ponderosa pine/Douglas
7 tonnes per hectare

C-3 fuel type pre-harvest
Mature lodgepole pine
27 tonnes per hectare

M-2 fuel pre-harvest
Mature spruce/balsam fir
32 tonnes per hectare

Harvesting types, methods, and timing can have a substantial impact on the fuel loading as is shown below. Large organic debris is necessary but excessive residue can have a negative impact on other objectives.

Forest harvesting operations result in a varied amount of residue and slash being left on all areas. In order to reduce the potential for serious wildfires, all licenses will continue to be reviewed for natural forest fuel levels (currently assessed at the SP) and the effects of harvest systems on fuel loading. Post harvest assessments will be done to rate fuel loading and provide options to be used to reduce debris levels to acceptable levels.

C-7 post harvest
15 tonnes per hectare

C-3 post harvest
76 tonnes per hectare

M-2 post harvest
75 tonnes per hectare

Post harvest hazard assessments completed during final inspections will be based on the 'Photo Guide for Quantifying Forest Fuels in the Kamloops Forest Region' or other approved methodology in place at the time of the assessment. Forest fuels and harvest debris will be assessed in tonnes per hectare based on photo comparison or actual fuel plots as per 'FRDA Handbook 11'. All SBFEP blocks will be assessed for fuel modification that brings fuel loading down to acceptable levels while meeting the objectives for maintaining biodiversity and large organic debris, as per the *FPC of BC Act*. Unless stated otherwise in the SP, landings will be burned to eliminate harvesting debris. Where heavy fuel loading is anticipated it will be dealt with on a site specific basis in the SP. SP's and harvest considerations will generally allow forest debris to meet the guidelines set out below. It is the intent of the SBFEP to manage forest fuels to ensure that the target fuel loading (as outlined below) is achieved. However; other factors such as silviculture system, harvesting method, retention levels, block layout, access and sensitivity to burning will impact on the suitability and success of fuel reduction methods and may dictate whether we can achieve these target fuel loads or not. The following outlines specific maximum fuel loads by fuel type which in some circumstances may be overachieved.

General Post Harvest Fuel Loading Guidelines by Major Fuel Types

Note: Fuel types reflect major species only. Most areas will have a variety of other species on site as well. The tonnes per hectare targets are desirable to meet fire management goals.

C7 Fuel Types

Selective harvest, mature Douglas-fir and ponderosa pine. Recommended maximum fuel loading is 35 tonnes per hectare with a maximum slash depth of one meter for natural or piled debris.

31 tonnes/hectare

C3 Fuel Types

Mature lodgepole pine clearcut. Recommended maximum fuel loading is 35 tonnes per hectare with a maximum slash depth of one metre for natural or piled debris.

35 tonnes/hectare

M2 Fuel Types

Clearcut spruce/balsam. Recommended maximum fuel loading is 40 tonnes per hectare with a maximum slash depth of one metre for natural or piled debris.

40 tonnes/hectare, fuels over one metre in height
Fire control and planting will be a challenge

C. General Observations

Fuel levels of greater than 25 tonnes per hectare will reduce the effectiveness of drag scarification. Fuel levels of greater than 40 tonnes per hectare will increase the challenge for planters to meet target stocking. The fuel loading could also have a negative impact on planting quality and survival.

D. Fuel Breaks

Fuel breaks have been incorporated into the SBFEP chart area. Fuel break needs will be managed during the access planning phase. Fuel breaks for the most part will be designed around access plans for harvest. Primary access roads are being designed to Class 6 and this break along with disposal of road side harvest debris will create a defendable line. Harvest blocks along main roads may require additional fuel reduction along the road for a distance of 20 metres along the right of way. The target fuel level for fuel breaks is a fuel loading of less than 10 tonnes per hectare.

E. Prescribed Burning

Prescribed Burning is an acceptable treatment within several chart areas of the SBFEP. The most appropriate treatment will be used to manage the land base and meet free to grow. Where the recommended treatment is prescribed burning the SP will reflect the need to develop the area and apply harvest methods that compliment burning, while minimizing cost and/or site impacts. The application of prescribed fire will be planned by district staff at the Forest Development level and/or SP phase. Burning plans will be completed prior to treatment in compliance with the *FPC of BC Act* and Forest Prevention Regulations.

Post Harvest Assessment

Spruce bark beetle area, helicopter Harvest, no access. Fuel loading 65- 75 tonnes per hectare. Planting spots 200 – 300, target planting needs 1,200 stems per hectare.

Post Burn Assessment

Fuel loading estimated at 35 – 40 tonnes per Hectare. Plantable spots 1,000 – 1,600, average 1,450 per hectare.

3.1.2 Small Scale Salvage Program

In 1998, the Merritt Forest District SBFEP initiated a Small Scale Salvage Program (SSSP). The objective of the SSSP is to facilitate the detection and harvesting of small scattered parcels of imperilled timber not harvested in the normal course of timber harvesting operations. The SBFEP is allocating approximately 11,500m^3 annually to harvest under the SSSP. Currently the annual volume harvested since 1998 has well exceeded this number due to extra volume being harvested under the Forest Service Reserve.

The intent of the program is not to replace the existing salvage operations inherent to licensee's stewardship responsibilities on their respective operating areas. Nor is it the intent of the program to create a steady supply of fibre to any firm or individual.

The program will strive to be market sensitive by facilitating salvage of material which matches client needs whenever possible. Material targeted for recovery under the SSSP will occur across the Merritt TSA and will consist of but will not be limited to:

- Imperilled timber consisting of standing and/or downed timber which is infested or susceptible to infestation by forest pests, such as bark beetles, which if left will lead to more serious levels of infestation;
- Windthrow, fire or otherwise damaged timber including dead standing and down material where pest control may not be an objective;
- Other material such as logging debris or special products not harvested in the normal course of harvesting operations.

Activities carried out under the salvage program will reflect a balance between the economic benefits and the non-timber values of dead down and standing timber.

The majority of volume recovered under the SSSP will be exempt from inclusion within the FDP. Section 10(3) of the *FPC of BC Act* allows minor salvage operations to be exempt from showing road and block development within the FDP. A minor salvage operation is defined in the *FPC of BC Act* OPR as any harvesting of:

(a) timber that

(i) is dead, infested with pests or otherwise damaged or that is required to be harvested to facilitate the removal of the dead, infested or damaged timber, or

(ii) is required as part of a sanitation treatment, and is of a total volume not exceeding 2,000^{m3}, excluding the volume harvested from any road clearing width, if the road is required to facilitate the removal of timber referred to in subparagraph (i) or (ii), or

(b) special forest products.

The following are examples where the above provisions of the *FPC of BC Act* and *OPR* may be used:

- to expedite the recovery of timber that is infested or susceptible to infestation by forest pests such as bark beetles which if left will lead to more serious levels of infestation to adjacent healthy stands;
- recover imperilled (wind thrown) timber where timely recovery is necessary to minimize loss of economic value;
- recovery of dead standing and down material.

In addition to the above, there are two circumstances in which SSS may be exempted from the requirement of a SP. The first being; harvest employing a silviculture system of clearcut where the size of the opening created is not greater than 1 hectare and the volume does not exceed 500^{m3} , and second, where a silviculture system other than clearcut is used and the volume does not exceed 500^{m3}. The above stated exemptions are pursuant to section 30 of the *FPC of BC Act.* Although SP exemptions are common practice the SSSP develops the majority of their volume under a SP.

Measures to protect forest resources under the SSSP will be consistent with the measures as stated in this plan.

Minor salvage in sensitive ecosystems will follow direction as outlined in the internal letter dated December 15, 1998 'Terms and Conditions for Merritt Forest District, Small Business Forest Enterprise Program's Harvest of Minor Salvage in Sensitive Ecosystems in Areas Without a Silviculture Prescription for the SBFEP'. In many instances this will require a consultative process between the SBFEP and MOELP.

Referral of SSS activities will be consistent with an internal memorandum dated May 11, 2000 and approved on July 10, 2000 (or unless otherwise directed by the DM).

3.12 Visual Landscape Management

Issues

On July 2, 1999 the District Manager made known established Visual Quality Objectives (VQO's) as a result of the Lakes Classification LRUP project. These are the only formally established VQO's within our planning area and are generally tied to areas in and around the lakeshore management zone. However, there are a number of other visually sensitive areas in which the District Manager has recommended VQO's. These areas generally include, but are not limited to, all primary and secondary highway corridors.

On February 3, 1999 the SBFEP received approval of a minor FDP amendment dealing with salvage development and the requirement to complete visual impact assessments in scenic areas within IBM epidemic areas (in SBFEP areas south of Princeton along highway 3 to Manning Park). Due to the level of infestation and the volatility of the IBM within the scenic area it was agreed that the SBFEP would complete a post harvest assessment on areas where the SBFEP have been actively harvesting as opposed to completing Visual Impact Assessments (VIA's) as harvesting progresses. The intent of the post harvest assessment is to isolate landscape units where visual quality class has been exceeded due to IBM harvest and to develop a harvest plan to reduce the visual impact. It should be recognized that there may be landscape units which will not benefit from this strategy and that the visual quality class will remain in an exceeded state. As well, there are existing landscape units impacted by past harvest within this corridor that are not the responsibility of the SBFEP (i.e. Weyerhaeuser's operating area within the corridor not affected by SBFEP development).

** SBFEP includes UTSL's amended to this plan (both inside and outside of SBFEP chart areas).

Measures to Protect

Whether development occurs within an established scenic area with established VQO's, or within a scenic area with recommended VQO's, the SBFEP is committed to managing to the stated VQO. In most cases a visual impact assessment will be completed to ensure the objectives are achieved. Measures to manage the scenic resource may include, but are not limited to, irregular block boundaries, prescribing on block retention and placement of WTP's.

With regard to the above post harvest assessment; the SBFEP has already conducted a pre-harvest summary which established major viewpoints with an associated photographic record to aid in the post-harvest assessment. When the IBM appears to be declining in these operating areas and the District Manager determines that the timing is appropriate, the SBFEP will initiate the process for completing the post-harvest assessment. Once completed, the recommendations of the assessment will be reviewed by the SBFEP and the district recreation officer in an attempt to identify rehabilitative options. In the interim at the stand level, the SBFEP are leaving as much Douglas fir as possible as well as managing cutblock boundary locations in an attempt to mitigate the visual impact.

It should be noted that a portion of this area discussed above falls within Weyerhaeuser's operating area. Discussions will occur with Weyerhaeuser prior to the post-harvest assessment to ascertain their level of involvement.

4. HARVESTING SECTION - CATEGORY A CUTBLOCK STRATEGIES

4.1 Harvest Summary Table

Where Y is indicated in the 'Section 16/17 Terrain Stability Assessment Consistent with 20(3) OPR' column of Table 4.1, the cutblock is consistent with the results and recommendations of that assessment. Where Y is indicated in the 'Section 16/17 Terrain Stability Assessment Consistent with 20(3) OPR' column, the cutblock complies with Section 7(2), 8(3), 8(4) of the *Timber Harvest Practices Regulation* and, depending on whether it is within the Community Watershed or out the cutblock complies with 7(3)(a) or 8(2)(a).

Note: the Uplift UTSL's are included in this section but are in separate tables.

A number of minor salvage blocks appear on the FDP maps. It should be noted that these blocks have not been through the formal FDP review and approval process and are considered minor salvage as defined in the *Forest Practices Code of BC Act*. Associated blocks and roads are not included in the FDP tables and are shown on the FDP maps for information purposes to aid in plan review and SBFEP tracking. Following is a list of the above TSL/roads which appear on the FDP maps:

Chart	**TSL(s)**
Jameson	A63346-1,2,3
Wolfe-Belgie North	A65085-3
	A61452-2
Wolfe-Belgie South	A63345-1,3,4

Minor salvage blocks and roads will be added to the maps of this plan from time to time

Unless otherwise indicated, the year of harvest/sale is not binding and may be subject to change.

Key for Harvest Summary Table,

For approved Category A Cutblocks on most recently approved FDP

Other proposed A are included where information is available

Current Category Status		Joint Approval MOF/ MELPLP		Forest Cover	Harvest Method		Silviculture System		Sec. 16/17 Terrain stability Field Assessments		Section 37 Assessments Completed? (indicate Y/N, NR)	
									Complete	Consistent with Sec 20(3) OPR	–	Not determined
I	Information	HLP	Higher Level Plan	Best available information For example, cruise or forest cover	A	Aerial	CC	Clearcut	Y/N	Yes, No	T	Terrain Stability field
PA	Proposed A	CW	Community Watershed	Enter Species and Species Percent for up to five Species	C	Cable	CCR	Clearcut with reserves	NR	None Required	R	Riparian
A	Approved A	M	Mutual Consent		GB	Ground Based	ST	Seed Tree			V	Visual Impact
CP/ TSL	Cutting Permit Issued (A)	N	No		- / -	combination of more than one method	P	Partial Cut			A	Archeological Impact
PS	Proposed expedited major Salvage (PA)						Sel	Single Tree Selection			P	Pest Incidence Survey
S	Approved expedited major Salvage (A)						GS	Group Selection			G	Gully

4.1 Harvest
Summary Table
Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appvl Req'd? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale if critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
092H036	Arrastra		16	11	3500	A	N	S50B50	9	4	5	GB	CC	ESSFdc	11	2011	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H036	Arrastra		22	8	2300	A	N	S60B40	7	3	4	GB	CC	ESSFdcp	11	2011	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H036	Arrastra		28	12	3500	A	N	Pl60S30B10	5	3	7	GB	CC	MSdm2	11	2011	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H036	Arrastra		31	13	4400	A	N	S40B30PL30	8	4	5	GB	CC	MSdm2	11	2011	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H036	Arrastra		40	13	4300	A	N	Pl50S30B20	5	2	6	GB	CC	MSdm2	11	2011	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H036	Arrastra		7	16	5300	A	N	S60B40	9	4	4	GB	CC	ESSFdcp	11	2011	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H056	Champion	A42310	1	18	7000	A	N	Pl60S30B20	6	3	2	C	CC	ESSFwm	11	2004	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H056	Champion	A42310	2	28	11760	A	N	Pl45S40B10F5	8	4	5	GB	CCR	ESSFwm	11	2004	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H056	Champion	A42310	3	16	2700	A	N	Pl60S25B15	6	3	4	C	CC	ESSFwm	11	2004	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H046	Champion	A47984	1	20	4170	A	N	S40Pl35B25	8	4	6	GB	CC	ESSFwm	11	2005	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H046	Champion	A47990	1	9	3550	A	N	Pl60S25B15	8	3	6	C	CC	ESSFwm	11	2005	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H046	Champion	A47990	2	17	8350	A	N	B60S30Pl10	7	3	8	GB	CC	ESSFwm	11	2005	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H046	Champion	A47991	1	23	7250	A	N	Pl70S20B10	7	3	6	C	CC	ESSFwm	11	2005	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H046	Champion	A47992	1	23	4480	A	N	Pl55S35B10	7	3	7	C	CC	ESSFwm	11	2005	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appvl Req'd? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale If critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp. (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
092H017	Copper Creek East	A62335	1	64	15246	TSL	N	Pl95Fd5	8	3	5	GB,C,A	CC	MSdm2	12	2001	NR	-						
092H018	Copper Creek East	A62336	1	22.6	2926	TSL	N	Pl70Fd30	6	3	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	12	2001	NR	-						
092H017	Copper Creek East	A65083	1	22	4200	A	N	Pl7Fd3	6	3	6	C,GB	CCR	MSdm2	13	2001	NR	-	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H027	Copper Creek West	A55987	1	38	13300	A	N	S70B20F10	8	5	4	GB	CCR	MSdm2	12	2003	NR	-	N	N	Y	NR	NR	NR
092H027	Copper Creek West	A55988	1	38	13300	A	N	S60B30F10	9	4	4	GB	CCR	MSdm2	13	2003	NR	-	N	N	Y	NR	NR	NR
092H088	Elusive	A50517	1	20.3	5075	A	N	Pl100	4	2	8	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	10	2006	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
092H089	Elusive	A50517	2	13.5	2700	A	N	Pl90B10	4	2	5	GB	CC	IDFdk2	10	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H088	Elusive	A50517	3	15	3000	A	N	Pl100	4	2	8	GB	CC	IDFdk2	10	2006	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
092H088	Elusive	A50517	4	26.1	5220	A	N	Pl100	4	2	7	GB	CC	IDFdk2	10	2006	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
092H088	Elusive	A50517	5	16	3200	A	N	Pl90F10	7	3	5	GB	CCR	IDFdk2	10	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H088	Elusive	A50517	6	13.6	3500	A	N	Pl100	4	2	5	GB	CC	IDFdk1	10	2006	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
092H069	Grant-Finnegan	A56191	1	18.8	5800	A	N	Pl100	7	2	9	GB	CC	MSxk	10	2002	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H069	Grant-Finnegan	A56191	2	30.7	5200	A	N	Pl100	7	2	8	GB	CC	MSxk	10	2002	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H069	Grant-Finnegan	A56191	3	58.2	5200	A	N	Pl100	5	2	9	GB	CC	MSxk	10	2002	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H069	Grant-Finnegan	A56191	4	5.4	650	A	N	Pl97FD3	4	2	7	GB	CC	MSxk	10	2002	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H069	Grant-Finnegan	A56191	5	55.2	1300	A	N	Pl96Sx4	7	2	9	GB	CC	MSxk	10	2002	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appvl Req'd? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale If critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp. (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
092H069	Grant-Finnegan		1	3	930	A	N	Pl100	7	2	7	GB	CC	MSxk	10	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H038	Jameson Lake	A50512	CP A-1	111	20000	TSL	N	Pl5Fd5	8	3	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk1		2001	NR	-						
092H038	Jameson Lake	A50512	CP A-2	126	25200	TSL	N	Pl5Fd5Sx1	7	3	7	GB	CCR	MSxk		2001	NR	-						
092H038	Jameson Lake	A50512	CP C-3	20	4000	TSL	N	Pl5Fd5	7	3	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk1		2001	NR	-						
092H065	July	A42375	1	14	3600	A	N	B90S10	8	2	5	GB	CC	ESSFwm	6	2004	NR	-	N	N	Y	NR	NR	NR
092H065	July	A56181	5	15	4000	A	N	B60S40	9	5	3	GB	CC	ESSFwm	6	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H078	Ketchan	A43608	1	20.9	7249	A	N	Pl90F10	6	3	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	9	2001	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H078	Ketchan	A43608	2	26	10667	A	N	Pl6Fd2Sx2	5	2	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	9	2001	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H078	Ketchan	A43608	3	20.3	3997	A	N	Pl70Fd30	6	3	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	9	2001	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H078	Ketchan	A66793	1	23.4	7458	A	N	Pl7Sx2Fd1	6	3	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	9	2002	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H088	Ketchan	A65998	CP A-1	18.2	5460	A	N	Pl7Sx2Fd1	6	3	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	9	2001	NR	-	NR	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H078	Ketchan	A43608	1A	20	2800	A	N	Pl50F50	6	3	5	GB	GS	MSdm2	9	2006	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
092H078	Ketchan	A66794	1	21	4300	A	N	Pl70F30	6	3	5	GB	CC	MSdm2	9	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H078	Ketchan		1N	23	5000	A	N	Pl50F40Sx10	6	3	5	GB	CCR	MSxk	9	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H078	Ketchan		1P	35	8400	A	N	Pl40F40Sx10B10	6	3	5	GB	CCR	MSxk	9	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H078	Ketchan		1S	25	6800	A	N	Pl90F10	6	3	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	9	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appvl Req'd? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale If critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp. (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
092H088	Loon Lake	A65092	1	14	2428	A	N	Pl90Fd10	5	2	7	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	7	2001	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H088	Loon Lake	A65996	1	100	25000	A	N	Pl9Fd1	7	3	6	GB	CC	IDFdk2	7	2001	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092I025	Manning	A42308	10	30	8100	A	N	Pl6S2Fd1Bl1	8	2	7	GB	CCR	MSxk	1	2003	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092I025	Manning		43	15	1000	A	N	F90Py10	8	3	3	GB	SEL	IDFxh2	1	2003	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092I025	Manning		47	19	1500	A	N	F40Pl40S20	9	3	5	GB	SEL	IDFxh2	1	2003	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092I025	Manning		5	18	1600	A	N	F40S30B20	8	3	5	GB/C	SEL	IDHxh2	1	2003	N	-	NR	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092I025	Manning Creek	A42307	9	11	2700	A	N	Pl90F10	7	3	7	GB	CCR	MSxk	1	2003	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H076	Matthew Creek	A61785	CP E-1	20.8	4160	TSL	N	Pl7Fd3	7	3	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	8	2001	NR	-						
092H077	Matthew Creek	A61785	CP E-2	4.2	756	TSL	N	Pl5Fd5	7	2	4	GB	CCR	MSdm2	8	2001	NR	-						
092H077	Matthew Creek	A61785	CP E-3	10.4	1976	TSL	N	Pl6Fd2Sx2	7	2	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	8	2001	NR	-						
092H076	Matthew Creek	A61785	CP E-4	9.7	1940	TSL	N	Pl5Fd5	5	2	6	GB	CCR	MSdm2	8	2001	NR	-						
092H076	Matthew Creek	A61785	CP E-5	7.5	1125	TSL	N	Pl6Fd3Sx1	6	2	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	8	2001	NR	-						
092H076	Matthew Creek		39	20	2200	A	N	F70Pl20S10	6	2	5	GB	GS	MSdm2	8	2003	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H076	Matthew Creek		43	17	3400	A	N	F80Pl20	6	2	5	GB	GS	MSdm2	8	2003	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H077	Matthew Creek		61	21	2600	A	N	F90Pl10	7	3	5	A	SEL	IDFdk2	8	2004	NR	-	N	N	Y	Y	NR	NR
092H077	Matthew Creek		64	18	1900	A	N	F80Pl10Sb10	8	4	5	GB	GS	IDFdk2	8	2004	NR	-	N	N	Y	NR	NR	NR
092H077	Matthew Creek		71	10	1000	A	N	F70Pl20S10	5	2	6	GB	GS	IDFdk2	8	2004	NR	-	N	N	Y	NR	NR	NR
092H076	Matthew Creek		73	22	2400	A	N	Pl90F10	7	2	7	GB	CCR	MSdm2	8	2003	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appvl Req'd? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale If critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp. (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
092H076	Matthew Creek		84	18	4300	A	N	Pl70F20S10	5	2	6	C,GB	CCR	IDFdk2	8	2004	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H076	Matthew Creek		87	13	1300	A	N	F60Pl40	7	2	7	GB	GS	IDFdk2	8	2004	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H060	McNulty	A55792	1	35.5	11100	A	N	Pl100	6	3	7	GB	CC	ESSFxc	14	2002	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H060	McNulty	A55793	1	21.6	5500	A	N	Pl100	6	3	7	GB	CC	ESSFXC	14	2002	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H060	McNulty	A55960	1	14	3737	A	N	Pl100	6	2	9	GB	CC	MSxk	14	2002	NR	-	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H060	McNulty	A55961	1	40.9	9700	A	N	Pl100	7	3	5	GB	CC	ESSFxc	14	2002	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H060	McNulty	A61588	1	42.6	9950	A	N	Pl100	7	2	8	GB	CC	ESSFxc	14	2002	NR	-	N	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H070	McNulty	A61588	2	61.8	12000	A	N	Pl100	7	2	7	GB	CC	ESSFxc	14	2002	NR	-	N	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H060	McNulty	A61588	3	34.6	6920	A	N	Pl100	7	2	5	GB	CC	ESSFxc	14	2002	NR	-	N	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H070	McNulty		21	63	15945	A	N	Pl100	7	2	7	GB	CCR	ESSFxc	14	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H075	Michael	A42346	7	7	2800	TSL	N	B70S20Pl10	8	3	1	GB	CC	ESSFwm	5	2001	NR	-						
092H075	Michael	A42346	8	9	3800	TSL	N	B90S10	8	3	4	GB	CC	ESSFwm	5	2001	NR	-						
092H075	Michael	A42367	1	10.5	2600	A	N	B60S30Pa10	9	3	2	GB	CC	ESSFFmw	5	2002	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H075	Michael	A42368	1	12.2	3600	A	N	B70S20Pa10	9	3	2	GB	CC	ESSFmw	5	2002	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H057	Otter Mountain	A43034	1	28	3700	A	N	F50Py30Pl20	4	2	4	A	CCR	IDFdk2	8	2002	NR	-	N	N	Y	Y	NR	NR
092H057	Otter Mountain	A57413	1	35	4375	A	N	F50Py30Pl20	8	3	3	GB	SEL	IDFdk2	8	2001	NR	-	N	N	Y	Y	NR	NR
092H057	Otter Mountain		12	13	1625	A	N	F70Py30	4	2	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk2	8	2003	NR	-	N	N	Y	Y	NR	NR

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appvl Req'd? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale If critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp. (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
092H100	Pattinson	A42371	1	12	3000	A	N	PI100	7	2	7	GB	CC	MSxk	7	2003	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H100	Pattinson	A42372	1	15	3750	A	N	PI100	7	3	6	GB	CC	MSxk	7	2003	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H100	Pattinson		12	7	1750	A	N	PI100	7	3	7	GB	CC	MSxk	7	2004	NR	-	N	N	N	Y	NR	NR
092H099	Pattinson		13	22	5500	A	N	PI100	8	3	6	GB	CC	MSxk	7	2004	NR	-	N	N	N	Y	NR	NR
092I010	Pennask	A42303	1	14.4	3600	A	N	PI90S10	8	3	5	GB	CC	MSxk	4	2005	NR	-	N	Y	Y	NR	NR	NR
092I010	Pennask	A42303	2	11	2750	A	N	PI100	6	3	7	GB	CC	MSxk	4	2005	NR	-	N	Y	Y	NR	NR	NR
092I010	Pennask	A42303	3	17.6	4400	A	N	PI100	7	3	8	GB	CC	MSxk	4	2005	NR	-	N	Y	Y	NR	NR	NR
092I035	Pimainus	A42320	1	9.7	2382	TSL	N	PI100	7	3	5	GB	CC	MSxk	1	2005	NR	-						
092I045	Pimainus	A42320	2	12.7	2382	TSL	N	PI60S30B10	7	3	5	GB	CC	MSxk	1	2001	NR	-						
092I045	Pimainus	A42320	6	15.6	3970	TSL	N	PI100	6	3	7	GB	CC	MSxk	1	2001	NR	-						
092I045	Pimainus	A56191	6	31.3	7100	A	N	PI100	8	2	7	GB	CC	MSxk	1	2006	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092I035	Pimainus	A57342	1	10.3	1900	TSL	N	PI100	7	3	6	GB	CC	MSxk	1	2001	NR	-						
092I045	Pimainus	A57342	2	7.5	1907	TSL	N	PI100	7	3	5	GB	CC	MSxk	1	2001	NR	-						
092I045	Pimainus	A57342	3	15	2164	TSL	N	PI90S10	8	3	6	GB	CC	MSxk	1	2001	NR	-						
092I035	Pimainus	A64948	7	33.5	8900	TSL	N	PI90S10	7	3	6	GB	CC	MSxk	1	2001	NR	-						

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appvl Req'd? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale If critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp. (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
092I035	Pimainus		1	7.6	1700	PA	N	Pl9Sx1	7	3	7	GB	CCR	MSxk	1	2005	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
092I035	Pimainus		2	21	4700	PA	N	Pl9Sx1	7	3	7	GB	CCR	MSxk	1	2005	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
092I035	Pimainus		3	19	4900	PA	N	Pl9Sx1	8	3	4	GB	CCR	MSxk	1	2005	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
092I035	Pimainus		4	17	3400	PA	N	Pl100	7	3	7	GB	CCR	MSxk	1	2005	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
092H099	Quilchena	A50408	1	17	2500	A	N	Pl90F10	7	3	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	7	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	Y	NR	NR
092H099	Quilchena		10	11	1000	A	N	Pl100	3	1	9	GB	CC	MSxk	7	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H099	Quilchena		2	12	2000	A	N	Pl100	3	1	9	GB	CC	MSxk	7	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	Y	NR	NR
092H099	Quilchena		20	24	3600	A	N	Pl90F10	7	2	1	GB	CC	MSxk	7	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H099	Quilchena		5	14	2100	A	N	Pl100	3	1	9	GB	CC	MSxk	7	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H099	Quilchena		7	13	1600	A	N	Pl100	3	1	7	GB	CC	MSxk	7	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H056	Rabbitt	A42319	1	21	4700	A	N	F60Pl20S20	6	4	7	GB	CCR	MSdm2	8	2003	NR	-	N	N	NR	Y	NR	NR
092H057	Rabbitt	A42320	7	11.8	3800	TSL	N	Pl70Fd30	6	3	7	GB	CCR	MSdm2	8	2001	NR	-						
092H056	Rabbitt	A42320	8	17.7	5200	TSL	N	Pl70Fd30	6	3	8	GB	CCR	MSdm2	8	2001	NR	-						
092H056	Rabbitt	A42320	9	18.4	8400	TSL	N	Fd70S20Pl10	6	4	7	GB	CC	MSdm2	8	2001	NR	-						
092H056	Rabbitt	A42327	1	27	7300	A	N	F60Pl20S20	6	4	7	GB	CCR	MSdm2	8	2003	NR	-	N	N	N	Y	NR	NR
092H066	Rabbitt	A43030	1	18	7740	A	N	S50Pl40B10	6	3	6	GB	CC	MSdm2	8	2003	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	Y	NR	NR
092H057	Rabbitt	A43959	1	127	10161	A	N	F70Py25Pl5	6	3	3	C.GB	SEL	IDFdk2	8	2002	NR	-	NR	N	Y	NR	NR	NR
092H056	Rabbitt	A43959	2	98	7840	A	N	F70Py25Pl5	7	4	5	C.GB	SEL	IDFdk2	8	2003	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP)

Map Ref. No	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appvl Req'd? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale if critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp. (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
092H056	Rabbitt	A43959	3	69	5520	A	N	F70Py25Pl5	6	4	4	C,GB	SEL	IDFdk2	8	2003	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
092H045	Railroad	A66788	5	21.9	5882	A	N	B70S20Pl10	7	4	7	GB	CC	ESSFwm	11	2001	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H045	Railroad	A66788	7	13.5	3368	A	N	S60B40	6	3	4	GB	CC	ESSFwm	11	2001	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H045	Railroad	A66788	8	6.9	1726	A	N	Bl95S5	8	3	7	GB	CC	ESSFwm	11	2001	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H087	Shea	A42362	1	32.8	3960	A	N	Fd50S30Pl20	8	4	4	GB	GS	IDFdk1	6	2003	NR	-	Y	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H097	Shea	A42364	1	68.1	8160	A	N	Fd90S10	8	4	1	GB	GS	IDFdk1	6	2003	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H079	Spukunne	A64948	1	35.9	9867	TSL	N	Pl80S15B5	8	3	5	GB	CC	MSdm2	10	2001	NR	-						
092H079	Spukunne	A64948	2	28	8940	TSL	N	Pl90B10	7	3	7	GB	CC	MSdm2	10	2001	NR	-						
092H079	Spukunne	A64948	3	36.3	9500	TSL	N	Pl100	6	4	6	GB	CC	MSdm2	10	2001	NR	-						
092H079	Spukunne	A64948	4	45.6	10300	TSL	N	Pl95B5	8	3	6	GB	CC	MSdm2	10	2001	NR	-						
092H079	Spukunne	A64948	5	25.8	9800	TSL	N	Pl90B10	8	4	5	GB	CC	MSdm2	10	2001	NR	-						
092H079	Spukunne	A64948	6	17.8	4500	TSL	N	S50Pl30B20	7	3	6	GB	CC	MSdm2	10	2001	NR	-						
092H079	Teepee		10	25	5700	A	N	Pl80S20	8	3	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	10	2005	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H079	Teepee		13	36	4000	A	N	Pl100	4	2	8	GB	CCR	MSdm2	10	2005	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appvl Req'd? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale If critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp. (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
092H079	Teepee		16	37	7800	A	N	PI100	4	2	7	GB	CCR	MSdm2	10	2005	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H079	Teepee		4	36	7200	A	N	PI90B10	6	2	8	GB	CCR	MSdm2	10	2005	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
0921026	Tyner Lake	A42320	3	29.9	6370	TSL	N	PI100	7	3	6	GB	CC	MSxk	1	2001	NR	-						
0921026	Tyner Lake	A42320	4	14.6	1964	TSL	N	PI90S5F5	8	3	5	GB	CC	MSxk	1	2001	NR	-						
0921045	Tyner Lake	A42320	5	11.6	1864	TSL	N	PI100	6	3	5	GB	CC	IDFdk2	1	2001	NR	-						
0921026	Tyner Lake	A42346	1	16.8	3600	TSL	N	PI100	8	3	7	GB	CCR	MSxk	1	2001	NR	-						
0921026	Tyner Lake	A42348	1	25	3713	A	N	PI100	8	3	6	GB	CC	MSxk	1	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
0921036	Tyner Lake	A42357	1	25	3125	A	N	PI100	8	3	5	GB	CC	MSxk/IDF	1	2003	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
0921036	Tyner Lake		1R	17	1850	A	N	PI100	7	2	6	GB	CC	MSxk/IDF	1	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
0921036	Tyner-Pimainus	A55635	1	33	2300	A	N	PI100	7	2	5	GB	CC	IDFdk1	1	2002	NR	-	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
0921035	Tyner-Pimainus	A55637	1	44	11553	A	N	PI100	7	2	7	GB	CCR	MSxk	1	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
0921035	Tyner-Pimainus	A55638	1	20	2531	A	N	PI100	7	2	7	GB	CC	MSxk	1	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
0921035	Tyner-Pimainus	A55639	1	44	13152	A	N	PI100	6	2	6	GB	CCR	MSxk	1	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
0921035	Tyner-Pimainus	A55640	1	40	11392	A	N	PI100	5	2	7	GB	CCR	MSxk	1	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
0921036	Tyner-Pimainus	A55644	1	34	8011	A	N	PI100	7	2	6	GB	CC	MSdm2	1	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	Y	NR	NR
0921036	Tyner-Pimainus	A55644	2	22	4682	A	N	PI97FD3	8	2	5	GB	CC	IDFdk1	1	2002	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appv'l Req'd? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale If critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp. (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
092I036	Tyner-Pimainus	A55644	3	46.6	3590	A	N	Pl89F11	8	2	6	GB	CC	IDFdk1	1	2006	NR	-	N	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092I035	Tyner-Pimainus	A65089	1	22	5500	A	N	Pl8Fd2	8	3	6	GB	CCR	MSdm2	1	2001	NR	-	N	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
092I035	Tyner-Pimainus	A65091	1	33.4	3300	TSL	N	Pl100	7	2	6	GB	CC	IDFdk1	1	2001	NR	-						
092I035	Tyner-Pimainus	A65091	2	40.3	5000	TSL	N	Pl100	8	2	6	GB	CC	IDFdk1	1	2001	NR	-						
092I034	Tyner-Pimainus		11	38.5	6698	A	N	Pl100	7	3	6	GB	CCR	MSdm2	1	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092I036	Tyner-Pimainus		12	34.7	8086	A	N	Pl100	8	2	6	GB	CCR	MSdm2	1	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092I036	Tyner-Pimainus		14	30.2	8773	A	N	Pl100	5	2	6	GB	CCR	MSdm2	1	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092I006	Wallace	A42375	2	17	4620	A	N	Pl90F10	6	3	7	GB	CCR	ESSFdc2	6	2006	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
092I006	Wallace	A43034	5	11	1060	A	N	Pl70F30	5	3	7	GB	GS	IDFdk2	6	2006	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H037	Whipsaw	A42323	10	30	2400	A	N	F90Pl10	9	4	1	GB	CCR	IDFdk2	12	2004	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A42359	1	31	9170	A	N	Pl80F10S10	8	4	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	12	2005	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H038	Wolfe-Belgie North	A62457	1	4.5	1200	TSL	N	Pl100	8	3	8	GB	CC	MSdm2	12	2001	NR	-						
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A62457	2	40.3	11000	TSL	N	Pl100	8	3	7	C,GB	CCR	MSdm2	12	2001	NR	-						
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A62457	4	9.6	2000	TSL	N	Pl75Fd25	7	3	6	C,GB	CCR	MSdm2	12	2001	NR	-						

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appvl Req'd? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale If critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp. (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A65093	2	18.7	4180	TSL	N	Pl70Sx20Fd10	7	3	5	GB	CCR	IDFdk2	12	2001	NR	-						
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A65094	2	32.5	6200	TSL	N	Pl60Fd40(Sx)	6	3	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk2	12	2001	NR	-						
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North		15	25	5100	A	N	Pl90S10	7	3	4	GB	CCR	ESSFxc	12	2006	NR	-	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North		24	10	2300	A	N	Pl100	8	3	7	GB	CCR	IDFdk2	12	2005	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie South	A63345	6	16.6	4000	TSL	N	Pl100	8	3	2	GB	CCR	MSdm2	12	2001	NR	-						
092H018	Wolfe-Belgie South	A65084	1	9.3	2000	A	N	Pl9Fd1	7	3	7	GB	CCR	MSdc	12	2001	NR	-	N	N	NR	NR	NR	NR

4.1 Harvest Summary Table

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP - UTSL)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appvl Req'd ? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale If critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp. (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
92H038	Wolfe Creek	65018	1	45	11500	TSL	N	Pl8Fd1Se1	8	3	7	GB	CCR	MSdm2	12	2001								
92H028	Wolfe Creek	65018	2	23.3	6000	TSL	N	Pl8Fd2	8	3	7	GB	CCR	MSdm2	12	2001								
92H018	Placer Creek	65018	3	26.5	7000	TSL	N	Pl7Se2Fd1	6	4	7	GB	CCR	MSdm2	12	2001								
92H018	Placer Creek	65018	4	35.8	9000	TSL	N	Pl7Se2Fd1	8	3	6	GB	CCR	MSdm2	12	2001								
92H018	Placer Creek	65018	5	4	1000	TSL	N	Pl8Fd1Se1	6	3	7	GB	CCR	MSdm2	12	2001								
92H018	Placer Creek	65018	6	4	1000	TSL	N	Pl9Fd1	8	3	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	12	2001								
92H028	Friday Creek	62922-D	1	12.4	3100	TSL	N	PlFd1	6	2	7	GB	CCR	MSdm1	12	2001								
92H037	Friday Creek	62922-D	2	9.5	2375	TSL	N	Pl8Fd2	5	2	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk2	12	2001								
92H088	Missezula Lake	62922-G	1	36.7	11010	TSL	N	Pl9FdSe1	6	5	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	9	2001								
92H088	Leonard Creek	62922-G	3	21	6300	TSL	N	Pl8SeF2	8	3	5	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	9	2001								
92H078	Dillard Creek	62922-G	5	32.3	9690	TSL	N	Pl8SeFdAt2	6	4	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	9	2001								
92H088	Missezula Lake	62922-G	6	11.6	2900	TSL	N	Pl9FdAt1	7	3	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	9	2001								
92H078	Dillard Creek	62922-G	7	27.9	6975	TSL	N	Pl8SeFdAt2	6	3	6	GB	CCR	MSdm2	9	2001								
92H078	Hook Lake	62922-G	8	12.9	2580	TSL	N	Pl8FdAt2	6	3	7	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	9	2001								

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP - UTSL)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	CP/TSL	Cutblock	Gross Area (ha)	Harv. Vol. m^3	Cutblock Category Status	Joint Appvl Req'd ? (CW, HLP, M or N)	Forest Cover Information				Harv. Method	Silv. Sys.	BEC	L/scape Unit No.	Year of Harv/ Sale If critical	For approved category A cutblocks on most recently approved FDP							
								Species Comp. (by %)	Age Class	Ht. Class	Crown Closure						S16 or S17 Terrain Stability Assessments		S37 Assessments Completed? (Y, N or NR)					
																	Completed ?	Consistent w. Assmnt & complies w. THPR?	T	R	V	A	P	G
92H088	Leonard Creek	62922-G	9	13.2	2700	TSL	N	Pl8FdAt2	6	2	6	GB	CCR	MSdm2	9	2001								
92H088	Shrimpton Creek	62922-G	10	25.4	6985	TSL	N	Pl7Fd3	6	3	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	9	2001								
92I044,045,54,55	Inkukuh	62922-H	1	58.2	13095	TSL	N	Pl8Fd2	6	2	5	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	1	2001								
92I044,045	Inkukuh	62922-H	2	17.4	3915	TSL	N	Pl8Fd2	5	2	4	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	1	2001								
92I044,045	Pimainus Creek	62922-H	3	107.1	24100	TSL	N	Pl7Fd3	7	3	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	1	2001								
92I035	Skuhost Creek	62922-H	4	15.8	3555	TSL	N	Pl9Fd1	8	3	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	1	2001								
92I044	Pimainus Creek	62922-H	5	18.8	4230	TSL	N	Pl8Fd2	7	3	7	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	1	2001								
92H069	Hayes Creek	62922-I	1	33.2	8300	TSL	N	Pl8Fd2	6	3	8	GB	CCR	IDFdk2	10	2001								
92H058	Jura Creek	62922-I	2	3.5	875	TSL	N	Pl8Fd2	7	4	4	GB	CCR	IDFdk1	9	2001								
92H058	Jura Creek	62922-I	5	4.5	1125	TSL	N	Pl8Fd2	4	2	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk2	9	2001								
92H058	Jura Creek	62922-I	6	15.2	3800	TSL	N	Pl9Fd1	4	2	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk2	9	2001								
92H058	Jura Creek	62922-I	7	28	7000	TSL	N	Pl100	6	3	6	GB	CCR	IDFdk2	9	2001								
92H058	Jura Creek	62922-I	8	21.9	5475	TSL	N	Pl9Fd1	6	3	8	GB	CCR	MSdm2	9	2001								
92H058	Jura Creek	62922-I	9	12.6	3150	TSL	N	Pl8Fd2	6	3	7	GB	CCR	MSdm2	9	2001								
92H058	Jura Creek	62922-I	10	27	6750	TSL	N	Pl8Fd2	6	3	6	GB	CCR	MSdm2	9	2001								
92H058	Jura Creek	62922-I	11	18.2	4550	TSL	N	Pl7Fd3	5	3	5	GB	CCR	MSdm2	9	2001								

5. FOREST PRACTICES CODE VARIANCES

This section highlights and explains variances from standards as allowed for in the legislation and regulations. The section is divided into three parts:

5.1 FDP Variance

Exemptions FDP, SP - Harvest of a Danger Tree

Putting into effect this FDP provides exemption pursuant to section 28 (1)(a) and 30 (1)(b) of the *FPC of BC Act*, from the requirement for a FDP and SP in the following circumstance:

Act, Reg, HLP Reference	Variance & Rationale
FPC of BC Act Section 28 (1)(a) DM, and DEO for areas of joint approval	Variance from FDP Hazardous trees located adjacent to industrial activities: Ref 28(1)(a). During operations within cutblocks or along road right-of-ways, trees hazardous to the safety of workers need to be removed according to the Worker's Compensation Board standards. Trees that will be removed are those immediately adjacent to areas of operations and are not more than 50 meters away from the block boundary or road right-of-way. Only trees that pose a safety hazard or trees that need to be removed to facilitate removal of the hazardous trees will be cut;
Section 30 (1)(b) DM	Variance from SP Hazardous trees located adjacent to industrial activities: Ref 28(1)(a), 30(1)(b). During operations within cutblocks or along roads and road right-of-ways, trees hazardous to the safety of workers need to be removed according to the Worker's Compensation Board standards. Trees that will be removed are those immediately adjacent to areas of operations and are not more than 50 meters away from the block boundary or road right-of-way. Only trees that pose a safety hazard or trees that need to be removed to facilitate removal of the hazardous trees may be cut.

Exemption For Stand Management Prescriptions

Putting into effect this FDP provides exemption pursuant to section 32 (1)(a) of the *FPC of BC Act*, from the requirement to prepare a stand management prescription as outlined in section 24 of the Act.

Act, Reg, HLP Reference	Variance & Rationale
FPC of BC Act Section 32 (1)(a) DM, and DEO for areas of joint approval	It is expected that single tree treatment activities will be required throughout the term of the plan. The SBFEP requests this exemption for the treatment of bark beetle infested trees within the area under the plan. Treatment activities may include MSMA, and or fall and burn of individual trees or small patches of beetle attack less than 1 hectare in size. Stands to be treated under this exemption will be limited to areas not operationally feasible to harvest. Maps identifying treatment locations are submitted as a component of the Unit Strategy meetings.

5.2 Harvesting Variance

Currently the SBFEP has no proposed cutblocks requiring a variance.

CP/TSL	Cutblock ID	Act, Reg, HLP Reference	Variance	Rationale

5.3 Access Variance

Currently the SBFEP has no proposed roads requiring a variance.

Road ID	Road Name	Act, Reg, HLP Reference	Variance	Rationale

6. ACCESS MANAGEMENT

6.1 Access Management General

Proposed Developments
The approximate location of proposed roads to be constructed or modified is illustrated on the FDP maps. Table 6.1.1 identifies proposed road construction / modification that provide access to harvesting activities. Information and location of roads scheduled for development in the short term is generally more accurate than that for roads planned later within the plan. The most accurate detail results from completion of assessments.

Please note that the Uplift UTSL's are included in this section but are in separate tables.

Linkages to public roads and highways are identified on the FDP **FSR/Road Permit Maintenance Maps** attached to this plan. This map is also to serve as showing existing and proposed deactivation as planned by the Merritt Forest District Engineering Department.

6.1.1 Road Construction, Modification, and Assessment Table

Key to Table 6.1.1

Legend					
Type of Work		**Bridge/Major Culvert Type**		**For roads approved on last FDP, Assessments under Sec. 4 and 5 of FRR Completed?**	
C	Construction	T	Temporary	Y	Yes
M	Maintenance	P	Permanent	N	Considered required but have not been completed
		note: location to the nearest 0.1 km station of road.		NR	None Required
				T	Terrain
				R	Riparian
				V	VIA, Visual
				A	AIA, Arch
				E	Soil Erosion

6.1.1 Road Construction, Modification and Assessment Table

Licence No: A16133 SBFEP

Map Ref. (BCGS)	Geographic Location (Provide Name)	Road ID	Road Name	Year (If Critical)	Type of Works	Length (0.1 km)	Bridges and Major Culverts				Joint approval required? (Y or N)	Assessments under Sec 4&5 of FRR completed?				
							Bridge Maj. Culvet Type	Bridge/Major Culverts Location	In Stream Work? (Y/N)	Date of work if Outside Work Window (YYYY/MM)		T	R	V	A	E
92H036	Arrastra	8479.01	--	--	C	3.9	P-Bridge	0.1	Y	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H036	Arrastra	8479.02	--	--	C	1.8	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H036	Arrastra	8479.03	--	--	C	1.4	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H036	Arrastra	8479.04	--	--	C	1.3	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H036	Arrastra	8479.05	--	--	C	0.8	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H056	Champion	8528.02	--	2002	C	20.1	P-Bridge (2)	1.0,1.2	Y	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H017	Copper Creek East	9362.03	--	--	C	3.0	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H017	Copper Creek East	9362.02	--	2001	C	1.1	T-Bridge	0.1	N	--	N	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR
92H017	Copper Creek East	9362.06	--	2001	C	1.7	--	--	--	--	N	Y	Y	NR	NR	NR
92H017	Copper Creek East	9362.07	--	2001	C	2.4	--	--	--	--	N	Y	Y	NR	NR	NR
92H017	Copper Creek East	9362.08	--	2001	C	0.1	--	--	--	--	N	Y	NR	NR	NR	NR
92H027	Copper Creek West	3600.06	A55987 spur	2002-	C	1.7	2 T-bridges	0.4,0.8	Y	--	N	N	N	N	NR	NR
92H027	Copper Creek West	3600.06	A55988 spur	2002	C	1.0	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	N	NR	NR
92H027	Copper Creek West	3600.06	Extension	2002	C	1.5	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	N	NR	NR
92H088	Elusive Creek	8529.04	A50517 spur	--	C	5.1	T-Bridge	0.5	Y	--	N	N	N	N	NR	NR
92H069	Grant Finnegan	8614.02	A56191-3 sp	--	C	0.2	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	N	NR	NR
92H069	Grant Finnegan	8614.02	A56191-5 sp	--	C	1.8	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H038	Jameson Lake	RP#12013	CP C-3 spur	2001	C	0.6	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H065	July	8473.02	Ext	--	C	1.3	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H078	Ketchan Lake	8529.23	--	--	M	3.2	--	--	--	--	N	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR
92H078	Ketchan Lake	8529.23	--	--	C	4.2	--	--	--	--	N	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR
92H078	Ketchan Lake	A43608-1	Spur	--	C	0.9	--	--	--	--	N	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
92H078	Ketchan Lake	A43608-2	Spur	--	C	0.8	--	--	--	--	N	NR	Y	NR	NR	NR
92H078	Ketchan Lake	A43608-3	Spur	--	C	0.6	--	--	--	--	N	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

Map Ref. (BCGS)	Geographic Location (Provide Name)	Road ID	Road Name	Year (If Critical)	Type of Works	Length (0.1 km)	Bridges and Major Culverts				Joint approval required? (Y or N)	Assessments under Sec.4&5 of FRR completed?				
							Bridge Maj. Culvet Type	Bridge/Major Culverts Location	In Stream Work? (Y/N)	Date of work if Outside Work Window (YYYY/MM)		T	R	V	A	E
92H078	Ketchan Lake	A66794-1	Spur	--	C	0.7	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H078	Ketchan Lake	3601	1P spur	--	C	0.6	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H078	Ketchan Lake	3601	1S spur	--	C	1.7	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H078	Ketchan Lake	3601	1N spur	--	M	1.7	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H078	Ketchan Lake	3601	1N spur	--	C	1.3	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H078	Ketchan Lake	A43608	1A spur	--	C	0.7	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	N	NR	NR
92H088	Ketchan Lake	A65598	CPA-blk1 sp	--	C	0.4	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H088	Loon Lake	A65092-1	Spur	2001	C	0.3	--	--	--	--	N	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
92H088	Loon Lake	A65996-1	Spurs	2001	C	3.1	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I025	Manning Creek	A4670.01	Blk 47 access	--	M	2.2	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I025	Manning Creek	Blk 43	Spur	--	C	0.6	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I025	Manning Creek	Blk 47	Spur	--	C	0.8	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I025	Manning Creek	A42307-9	Spur	--	C	0.4	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I025	Manning Creek	A42308	Blk 10-spur	--	C	1.4	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H076	Matthew Creek	8470.07	Blk 84 spur	--	C	1.9	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H076	Matthew Creek	8470.08	Blk 87 spur	--	C	0.3	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H077	Matthew Creek	8470.01	Blk 55 spur	--	C	1.5	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H060	McNulty Creek	8614.01	A55792 spur	--	C	1.2	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H060	McNulty Creek	8614.01	A55793-spur	--	C	0.3	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H060	McNulty Creek	6988.01	A61588-1 sps	--	C	0.8	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H060	McNulty Creek	6988.01	A61588-3 sp	--	C	0.5	--	--	--	--	N	NR	N	NR	NR	NR
92H060	McNulty Creek	8614.01	Blk 21 spurs	--	C	2.3	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H060	McNulty Creek	8614.01	A61588-2 sp	--	C	2.1	T-bridge	0.4	Y	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H060	McNulty Creek	8614.01	A61588-2 sp	--	M	1.9	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H061	McNulty Creek	8614.01	A55961-1 sp	--	C	4.0	T-Bridge	2.1	Y	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H075	Michael Lake	6069.07	Ext	--	C	0.4	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H057	Otter Mountain	9763.01	Ext	--	C	2.7	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H008	Pasayten River (2/3)	River Rd	--	--	M	18.7	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H100	Pattinson	RD-K1.03	A42371-1 sp	--	C	0.6	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR

Map Ref. (BCGS)	Geographic Location (Provide Name)	Road ID	Road Name	Year (If Critical)	Type of Works	Length (0.1 km)	Bridges and Major Culverts				Joint approval required? (Y or N)	Assessments under Sec.4&5 of FRR completed?				
							Bridge Maj. Culvet Type	Bridge/Major Culverts Location	In Stream Work? (Y/N)	Date of work if Outside Work Window (YYYY/MM)		T	R	V	A	E
92H100	Pattinson	RD-K1.02	A42372-1 sp	--	C	1.0	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H100	Pattinson	9764.01	Blk 13 spur	--	C	1.3	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H100	Pattinson	9764.01	Blk 13 spur	--	M	5.8	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H100	Pattinson	9764.02	Blk 13 spur	--	M	3.0	3 T-bridges	0.7,1.7,2.4	Y	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I010	Pennask	8551.01	--	--	M	1.2	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I010	Pennask	8551.01	A42303-3 sp	--	C	0.9	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I010	Pennask	8551.02	--	--	C	2.7	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I045	Pimainus	0814.03	A42320-6 sp	--	M	0.6	T-bridge	0.1	Y	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I035	Pimainus	Blk 3 sp	--	--	C	1.8	T-bridge	0.3	Y	--	N					
92I035	Pimainus	Blk 2	South spur	--	C	0.8	--	--	--	--	N					
92I035	Pimainus	Blk 4	Spur	--	C	1.4	--	--	--	--	N					
92H099	Quilchena	8707.01	Ext	--	M	11	T-bridge	10.5	Y	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H099	Quilchena	RD.G1.04	--	--	C	0.9	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H099	Quilchena	RD.G1.02	--	--	C	0.8	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H099	Quilchena	RD.G1	--	--	C	2.5	T-bridge	0.2	Y	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H087	Shea lake	A42364-1	South spur	--	C	0.8	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H087	Shea lake	A42364-1	North spur	--	C	0.9	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H087	Shea Lake	3602.02	--	--	M	5.8	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H079	Teepee Creek	Teepee	Main	--	M	12.0	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H079	Teepee Creek	Teepee	Blk 13 spur	--	C	1.1	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H079	Teepee Creek	Teepee	Blk 16 spur	--	C	1.5	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H079	Teepee Creek	Teepee	Blk 4 spurs	--	C	1.5	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H079	Teepee Creek	Teepee	Blk 10 spur	--	C	1.4	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I036	Tyner Lake	0814.03	A42357-sp	--	C	0.8	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I026	Tyner Lake	0814.04	1R spur	--	C	0.5	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I035	Tyner-Pimainus	A65089	Spur 1,2	--	C	0.5	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I035	Tyner-Pimainus	0814.18	Ext	--	C	2.3	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I035	Tyner-Pimainus	0814.18	--	--	M	5.9	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I035	Tyner-Pimainus	0814.21	--	--	C	1.1	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I035	Tyner-Pimainus	0814.17	--	--	C	0.3	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I035	Tyner-Pimainus	0814.19	--	--	C	2.5	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR

Map Ref. (BCGS)	Geographic Location (Provide Name)	Road ID	Road Name	Year (If Critical)	Type of Works	Length (0.1 km)	Bridges and Major Culverts				Joint approval required? (Y or N)	Assessments under Sec.4&5 of FRR completed?				
							Bridge Maj. Culvet Type	Bridge/Major Culverts Location	In Stream Work? (Y/N)	Date of work if Outside Work Window (YYYY/MM)		T	R	V	A	E
92I035	Tyner-Pimainus	0814.13	Blk 11,12	--	C	3.9	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I035	Tyner-Pimainus	0814.01	A55644 1,2,3	--	C	5.5	2 T-bridges	0.4,0.7	Y	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I006	Wallace Creek	8673.02	--	--	M	1.1	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I006	Wallace Creek	8673.01	Ext	--	C	1.5	T-bridge	0.8	Y	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92I006	Wallace Creek	8673.01	--	--	M	0.6	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H037	Whipsaw Creek	A42323	Blk 10 spur	--	C	0.9	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A65093	Blk 2 spur	2001	C	0.6	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A65094-2	West spur	2001	C	0.7	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A65094-2	East spur	2001	C	0.8	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A65094-2	South spur	2001	C	0.3	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	Block 15	Spur	--	C	0.4	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR
92H028	Wolfe-Belgie South	8305.06	Ext	--	C	1.6	--	--	--	--	N	N	N	NR	NR	NR

Licence No: A16133 SBFEP - UTSL

Map Ref. (BCGS)	Geographic Location (Provide Name)	Road ID	Road Name	Year (If Critical)	Type of Works	Length (0.1 km)	Bridges and Major Culverts				Joint approval required? (Y or N)	Assessments under Sec.4&5 of FRR completed?				
							Bridge Maj. Culvet Type	Bridge/Major Culverts Location	In Stream Work? (Y/N)	Date of work if Outside Work Window (YYYY/MM)		T	R	V	A	E
92I044/045/054/055	Inkukuh Creek	62922 C.P. H Blk. 1		2001	C	2	--	--	--	--	N	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
92I035	Skuhost Creek	62922 C.P. H Blk. 4		2001	C	0.8	T	0.4	N	N/A	N	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
92I044	Pimainus Creek	62922 C.P. H Blk. 5		2001	C	1.2	--	--	--	--	N	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

6.1.2 Interim Road Deactivation Table

The SBFEP has no planned interim deactivation for the first three years of the plan. Information contained in table 6.1.2 is the highest level of planned deactivation over the three year period and will be for planning purposes only.

All proposed deactivation is labeled on the FDP maps.

Interim Road Deactivation Table 6.1.2 Key

LEGEND	
Level of Deactivation	
T	Temporary
P	Permanent
SP	Semi Permanent

Note: In consideration of operational realities and to reduce disruptions and delays during maintenance operations, roads under maintenance responsibilities may be temporarily deactivated without being identified in the tables or maps of this plan. If this is the case, final deactivation will be as per the level identified on the maps or will be updated in the next submission of this plan.

All roads being deactivated under this plan must have **hazard warning** signage consistent with section 22 of the Forest Road Regulations.

6.1.3 Level of Access Type

The types of vehicles proposed to be accommodated given deactivation levels are as follows:

- Permanently deactivated roads: generally no vehicle usage is expected to be accommodated following permanent deactivation.
- Semi-permanently deactivated roads: will be left in a state that could accommodate all-terrain vehicles and may accommodate four-wheel drive vehicle use.
- Temporarily deactivated roads: should be able to accommodate all-terrain vehicles and four-wheel drive vehicles and other vehicles as conditions permit.

6.1.2 Interm Road Deactivation Table

Licence No: A16133 (SBFEP)

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	Road No./ Road Permit No.	Road Name or TSL block reference	Proposed Deactivation Year	Deactivation Level	Length
092H017	Copper Creek East	9362.06	A62335		T	2.2
092H017	Copper Creek East	9362.02	A65083		T	1.1
092H017	Copper Creek East	9362.03		2001	T	2.8
092H017	Copper Creek East	9362.08		2001	T	0.1
092H017	Copper Creek East	9362.07			T	2.4
092H018	Copper Creek East	9362.01		2001	P	0.6
092H018	Copper Creek East	9987.01	A62336		T	4.5
092H088	Elusive	8529.21			P	0.4
092H088	Elusive	8529.20			SP	0.7
092H038	Jameson Lake	RP #12013	All spurs CP A blk. 1		P	1.1
092H038	Jameson Lake	RP #12013	All spurs CP A blk. 2		P	2
092H038	Jameson Lake	RP #12013	CP C blk. 3 spur		SP	0.6
092H068	Ketchan	3601.06	Ketchan	2001	T	1.8
092H078	Ketchan	A43608	Blk. 1 spur	2002	P	0.9
092H078	Ketchan	A43608	Blk. 2 spur	2002	P	0.8
092H078	Ketchan	A43608	Blk. 3 spur	2002	P	0.6
092H088	Ketchan	CP A 65998	Blk. 1 spur	2001	P	0.4
092H066	Lawless	A42374-03	Poly 7		P	0.4
092H066	Lawless	5104.01			T	4.8
092H088	Loon Lake	A65996 All spurs			P	3.1
092I025	Manning	4670.06			T	1
092I025	Manning	4670.04			T	0.6
092H077	Matthew Creek	#11472	Blk. 1 C-D		P	0.4
092H077	Matthew Creek	#11472	Blk. 3 E-G		P	0.9
092H077	Matthew Creek	8470.01	A55636 (3 south spurs)		P	2.8
092H077	Matthew Creek	8470.02	A55636		P	1.1
092H077	Matthew Creek	#11472	Blk. 1 G-B		SP	1.1
092H077	Matthew Creek	8470.03	A55636		T	2
092H075	Michael	6069.04			T	2.5
092H075	Michael	6069.05			T	3.3
092H075	Michael	6069.06			T	3
092H075	Michael	6069.07			T	1.2
092H065	Mine Creek	9279.01	Upper Coldwater		SP	0.9
092H018	Pasayten - 3	0919	Br. 13, 14, 15		P	2.3
092H018	Pasayten - 3	A62339-1	Spur road		P	1.1
092H018	Pasayten - 3	A62339-2	Spur road		P	0.6
092H018	Pasayten - 3	Calcite Rd.			T	2.9
092H100	Pattison	RDK1.01			T	0.6
092H100	Pattison	RDK1.03			T	1.2
092I035	Pimainus	A42320-1	Spur		T	0.2
092I035	Pimainus	0814.03	Spur to A42320-6		T	0.9
092I035	Pimainus	0814.09			T	0.4
092I035	Pimainus	0814.08	A64948-7 spur		T	0.9
092I045	Pimainus	0814.10	A42320-2 spur		T	0.4
092I045	Pimainus	0814.03	Spur to A42320-5		T	0.4
092H045	Railroad	8528	Br. 4, 5, 6	2002	T	5.1
092H079	Spukunne	8529	Br. 31, 32, 33		P	1
092H079	Spukunne	8529.30	Blk. 5 spur		P	0.1
092H079	Spukunne	8529.27			SP	1.9
092H079	Spukunne	8529.29			T	1.8

Map Ref. No.	Geographic Location	Road No./ Road Permit No.	Road Name or TSL block reference	Proposed Deactivation Year	Deactivation Level	Length
092H045	Railroad	8528	Br. 4, 5, 6	2002	T	5.1
092H079	Spukunne	8529	Br. 31, 32, 33		P	1
092H079	Spukunne	8529.30	Blk. 5 spur		P	0.1
092H079	Spukunne	8529.27			SP	1.9
092H079	Spukunne	8529.29			T	1.8
092H079	Spukunne	8529	Br. 27, 28		T	1.7
092H079	Spukunne	8529.30			T	2.3
092H028	Sunday	9709.01	Friday Mountain		P	0.4
092H028	Sunday	Opening 80			P	0.3
092H028	Sunday	9397.03	Post Road		P	0.9
092H028	Sunday	9397.04			SP	0.6
092I026	Tyner	0814.04	A42320-3 spur		P	0.6
092I026	Tyner	0814.26			P	0.7
092I026	Tyner	0814.05	Opening 39 spur		P	0.3
092I026	Tyner	0814.05			SP	1.8
092I026	Tyner	0814	Br. 26, 27, 28		SP	1.9
092I026	Tyner	0814.26			T	1.1
092I035	Tyner-Pimainus	A65089	Spur 1, 2	2001	P	0.4
092I035	Tyner-Pimainus	0814.18		2001	SP	0.8
092I035	Tyner-Pimainus	0814	Br. 22, 23	2001	SP	0.8
092I035	Tyner-Pimainus	0814.15		2001	T	1.1
092H038	Whipsaw	9685	0.09		T	0.6
092H038	Whipsaw	9685	0.01		T	0.2
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	8305.04	Opening 53		P	1
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	R11814			P	1.8
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A62334-1	South spur		P	0.5
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A47998	All spurs		P	3.2
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A65094-2	West spur		P	2.8
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A65094-2	East spur		P	0.8
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	A65094-2	South spur		P	0.3
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	8305.17			SP	0.3
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	8305.17			T	0.9
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	8305	Br. 18, 19		T	2.8
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	8305.08			T	0.7
092H038	Wolfe-Belgie North	A65093-2	Spur		P	0.6
092H018	Wolfe-Belgie South	0919	.06		T	0.8
092H018	Wolfe-Belgie South	0919.08			T	2.7
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie South	8305.05			T	1.2
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie South	0919.04			T	1
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie South	0919.05			T	1.7
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie South	0919.04	(opening 102)		T	0.8
092H028	Wolfe-Belgie North	8305.01			P	0.9

6.2 Access Maintenance

The SBFEP and District Maintenance responsibilities are shown on the FDP **FSR/Road Permit Maintenance Maps** attached to this plan. This map forms an integral part of this plan and identifies commitments pursuant to section 18 (l)(i)(ii)(iv), (m) and (n - for district engineering roads).

6.3 Seasonal Use Roads

SBFEP has no roads designed as seasonal roads.

7.1 Advertisements

7.2 Review and Comment / Documentation and Referral

7.2.1 Letters

The SBFEP has not received letters from the public or stakeholders commenting on the Draft 2001 FDP during the review and comment period.

Following are public comments as a result of the Open Houses held in Princeton and Merritt.

7.2.2 First Nations

Following will be a summary of all First Nations referral issues. Please note the Cutblock Issues Table (section 7.4) may have been updated to reflect concerns/commitments as described below.

Upper Nicola Indian Band

On April 17, 2001 the SBFEP met with the UNIB to discuss concerns of an archaeological nature within Small Business operating areas. This was an informal meeting briefly discussing historic use and employment opportunities in which no specific archaeological concerns were identified that required SBFEP action.

Attached is a response letter dated July 10, 2001 submitted by the Upper Nicola Indian Band. Following is a summary of SBFEP comments/actions of the pertinent concerns as discussed in the letter.

Elusive/Galena Creek:

- The map base used for the FDP is supplied by the district and updated by the Inventory section. It is quite possible that these areas have not yet been updated. Finally, the SBFEP is guided by the Forest Practices Code with concerns regarding regeneration delay.

Ketchan Lake:

- New areas of infestation will follow the current "Referral Protocal".

Loon Lake:

- All new roads constructed (associated with the two blocks referred) will be permanently deactivated or rehabilitated.

Pattinson Lake:

- The SBFEP has no immediate plans to develop the east side of Pattinson Lake (Lithic Scatter is noted).
- Quaries identified during development in this chart will be noted and protection of these sites will be discussed with the Band.
- New development will be referred to the Band and areas containing trails can be addressed at this time. The SBFEP has no funding for trail mapping projects and understands that Ardew and the band is currently mapping trails in the general vicinity. However, if a proposed development has potential to impact an identified

trail, measures will be taken to lessen the impact.

Overall Comments:

Comments 1 through 12 have been considered and noted.

Upper Similkameen Indian Band

On June 19, 2001 the SBFEP met with the USIB to discuss concerns of an archaeological nature within Small Business operating areas. This was an informal meeting briefly discussing historic use, upcoming/past archaeological works, employment opportunities and other issues not pertaining to the FDP. No specific archaeological concerns were identified that required SBFEP action.

Attached is a response letter as submitted by the Upper Similkameen Indian Band. The letter clearly indicates that no archaeological field trips are required for areas under USIB jurisdiction. Therefore, the SBFEP is of the understanding that there are no outstanding First Nations concerns related to the 2001 FDP.

The SBFEP recognizes the current archaeological works being conducted and will work cooperatively with the band.

Nicola Tribal Association

Attached is a response letter as submitted by the Nicola Tribal Association. Following is a summary of SBFEP comments/actions of the pertinent concerns as discussed in the letter.

The NTA has noted that the vast majority of SBFEP blocks have received comment during past FDP reviews. It should be noted that any outstanding First Nations concern pertaining to the 1998 FDP has been carried forward to this plan. Therefore, the following text will discuss those blocks the NTA has identified for a Preliminary Field Reconnaissance.

CP A62335, A65083, A62336, A65084 and A65018 have all received past First Nations input and the TSL's are either at a Logged status, TSL status or SP approved (or awaiting approval) status. The SBFEP is in the opinion that these blocks have incorporated any identified First Nations concerns.

CP A50517-2 is identified in the 2001 FDP as a Category A approved block with no outstanding First Nations concerns. This status was a result of the 1998 FDP review and approval process which was then carried forward to this FDP submission. In addition, as a result of the draft 2001 FDP review and comment process, the USIB and UNIB have no concerns with proposed development in this area. The SBFEP is in the opinion that this block has been adequately referred. If during development something of cultural significance is identified the SBFEP will act accordingly.

TSL's: A55792, 55793,A55960, A55961 and A61588 are in the transition of becoming a Non-replaceable Forest License (NRFL). These blocks are noted as having outstanding First Nations concerns and can be addressed during the review and approval process of the NRFL's FDP submission.

Note: all TSL's mentioned within the NTA letter have been addressed with the above comments. The SBFEP recognizes the NTA's general comments regarding plant and animal species and will consider in operational planning where appropriate.

Westbank Indian Band

SBFEP has contacted the Westbank Indian Band on numerous occasions concerning referral comments pertaining to the draft 2001 SBFEP FDP. The SBFEP has received no comment to date and can only go on the assumption that there are no concerns.

7.2.3 Agencies

Ministry of Forests:

Attached is the MOF's joint agency review, dated April 23, 2001. Within this document are SBFEP's actions associated with the comments/concerns. Please note that all concerns were discussed with MOF staff and SBFEP actions are consistent with those discussions.

Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks:

Attached is a response letter dated May 22, 2001, submitted by Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks. Following is a summary of SBFEP comments/actions of the pertinent concerns as discussed in the letter.

General FDP Comments

1. Wildlife Corridors: The SBFEP is in agreement with the comments made.
2. "Large patch" deferrals and cutblocks: Noted
3. Riparian Classification: Noted
4. Riparian management Areas: Noted
5. Stream Crossings: Noted
6. Management for Rare Wildlife Species: Noted
7. Grizzly bears: Noted
8. Ungulate Winter range: Noted
9. Deciduous Trees: Noted
10. Maintenance of Stand Species Composition: Noted

Comments on Plan Text

A meeting was held with SBFEP and MOELP to discuss their specific comments regarding the text. Following will briefly outline changes and or rationales made as a result of this meeting. If no changes are discussed, MOELP has accepted the original wording.

3.3 Fisheries, Issues: "considered" has been changed to "addressed".

Measures to Protect: The statement requiring referral of stream crossings to MOELP has been deleted. Other comments are noted.

3.4 Riparian Management: wording has been modified as per the first bullet.

Stream Crossings: The statement requiring referral of stream crossings to MOELP has been deleted. Other comment is noted.

3.5 Wildlife, issues: Wording has been modified to reflect comments.

3.9.2 Wildlife Tree Patch: Wording modified to reflect comments and discussions. Some wording has been modified slightly but was agreed to at the meeting stated above. The exception to this is bullet number one, pertaining to recording the WTP percentage as a portion of the total area under the prescription. The

SBFEP feels that this is not a strategy and should be addressed in a different forum.

7.3 Cutblock Issues Table: These comments have been discussed with MOELP. They are satisfied with the draft text as their concerns have been addressed in section 3.5, Wildlife.

Department of Fisheries and Oceans:

On September 11, 2001 the SBFEP received comment (via phone conversation) from DFO that their draft FDP would not receive comment. It should be noted that SBFEP has incorporated all past DFO requests and will work cooperatively with DFO where required.

7.3 Summary of Revisions

Text: Attached will be pages of the final FDP Draft which identify **modifications or additions** as a result of the referral process. The changes have been highlighted in a "blue font" to aid in review.

Maps and Tables:

Wolfe-Blegie North: Maps replaced to be consistent with a minor amendment to the 1998 FDP dealing with road deactivation (amendment dated July 12, 2001). Tables were not updated.

A65093-1, and A65094-1. District review indicated that the blocks were logged. Map and tables 4.1,6.1 and 6.1.2 have been revised.

A62457-4: District review indicated that the road was built and deactivated. Map and tables revised.

A65093-1: District review indicated the spur accessing the block from the North did not exist (ie. was a trail and not utilized for harvesting). The road was deleted, map and table 6.1.2 were revised.

Wolfe-Belgie South: Table 6.1, spur 4 – 3.9km, has been deleted. Was entered in error. No mapping change required.

Ketchan Lake: Table 6.1 has been updated to reflect a revised modification length (#8529.23) resulting from an amendment to the 1998 FDP. Map revised as well.

Pasayten (Part 3), Tyner-Pimainus: Maps revised to be consistent with a minor amendment to the 1998 FDP dealing with road deactivation (amendment dated July 12, 2001). Tables were not updated.

Midday Creek, Pennask Lake, Pimainus, Tyner lake, Wallace Creek, Manning Creek: Maps revised to accurately reflect woodlot boundaries (as per MOF's joint agency review).

UTSL 61669 CPC: Map revised as a result of previously unidentified roads (as per MOF's joint agency review).

Rabbitt; Table 7.4, deleted reference to TSL A43959 2,3 as having outstanding First Nations issues. This area has been field confirmed by Copp/Gould (96) as requiring no further work.

- **Note:** Other changes to the text and tables have occurred as a result of First Nations and inter-agency reviews. Those changes have been discussed in section 7 of this plan as well.

7.4 Category A Cutblock Issues Tables

The following is a summary of the pertinent 1998 FDP comments, cutblock issues and known information as submitted by MOE in an effort to aid future planning and development. Additional information may be added by the SBFEP as deemed necessary.

The known information as provided by MOELP is broadly referenced within this section. Further SBFEP planning and development will refer to the 'Known Information' package dated September 15, 1999.

Only charts with specific issues are listed. If charts are not listed within this section the SBFEP are not aware of any issues pertaining to planning and development.

Arrastra

General

Located within the Arrastra grizzly bear compartment area. Not open until 2010. Because the blocks located within this chart were approved category A blocks prior to the grizzly bear guidelines being developed, the SBFEP will keep showing them on the FDP as category A blocks.

Access within chart should be designed to avoid conflict with alpine areas and existing trail networks. *SBFEP will account for this in future development and planning.*

SBFEP development must account for watershed concerns within this drainage. *Discussions with the district's Watershed Restoration Specialist will occur prior to development.*

MOE (known information)

Mountain beaver located within chart area. *SBFEP development will account for mountain beaver when developing this chart.*

First Nations

There may be a potential trail within the chart area. *The SBFEP will contact the appropriate band(s) to schedule a meeting time and place in order to review the comments/concerns more closely. If, as a result of this meeting, the band(s) still has outstanding concerns, the SBFEP will commit to a further review.*

Champion

General

A portion of the Hudson's Bay Trail is located within the chart. *Development will be in consultation with the district's Recreation Officer.*

Access within chart should be designed to avoid conflict with alpine areas *(will be dealt with under grizzly bear guidelines).*

This chart is located within the Olivine grizzly bear compartment. Open dates for harvest are from 2000-2010.

Block Specific Comments from Previous FDP

A42310-3 – Northern block boundary should be along road. *The SBFEP will address this at the layout stage.*

A47990-2 – District suspects mapping problem associated with this road/block. *The SBFEP will address this at the layout stage.*

The district has concerns with SBFEP not addressing high hazard beetle types to the south. . *The SBFEP will address this at the layout stage.*

A47984-1 – District questions selection silviculture system. *The SBFEP will address this at the layout stage.*

MOE (known information)

A 1997 survey found active mountain beaver to be located within TSL A42310-1,2,3. *SBFEP development will account for mountain beaver when developing this chart.*

First Nations

May be a potential trail within the chart area. *The SBFEP will contact the appropriate band(s) to schedule a meeting time and place in order to review the comments/concerns more closely. If, as a result of this meeting, the band(s) still has outstanding concerns, the SBFEP will commit to a further review.*

Copper Creek

General

Currently the SBFEP are revisiting the VQO's within Copper Creek West. This process will incorporate Manning Park and the district's Recreation Officer. Once this process is complete the SBFEP will amend the category I blocks to proposed A blocks.

Copper Creek west is within the Copper Creek grizzly bear compartment. Open dates for harvest are from 2000-2010.

Proposed development should account for MOE's Elk Corridor mapping.

MOE (known information)

Copper Creek west was found to contain mountain beaver sites.

Elusive Creek

General

District has indicated this is a NDT 4 type and larger blocks can be proposed. *This will be addressed during development.*

Grant Finnegan

General

This smallwood area is being sold under two separate licenses: NRFL A61106 and NRFL A65542. As such the licensees will have to prepare their own FDP and can incorporate the 1998 SBFEP FDP comments at that time. At present we are showing them in our plan as category A approved blocks to make the transition from FDP to FDP less onerous.

July Creek

MOE (known information)

All fish bearing waters of July Creek are designated as "Known Temperature Sensitive Streams".

Chart area was found to contain tailed frog.

Ketchan

General

MOE requests that planning include consideration for deer winter range values on all blocks. Preference for managing southeast to west aspects and lower elevation blocks to maintain large wolfy fir (vets and recruits).

The Anderson-Hacket Community Watershed bisects the southwest corner of the chart. No development or other SBFEP activities are affected.

The present deactivation of the most southern end of FSR 3601.06 has been discussed and agreed to with the Princeton Rod and Gun Club. Due to the beetle slowly moving north the SBFEP is deferring permanent deactivation of this section of road.

McNulty

General

This smallwood area is being sold under two separate licenses: NRFL A61106 and NRFL A65542. As such the licensees will have to prepare their own FDP and can incorporate the 1998 SBFEP FDP comments at that time. At present we are showing them in our plan as category A approved blocks to make the transition from FDP to FDP less onerous.

Manning

General

MOE has concern over proposals to cable harvest on adverse terrain with high wildlife values. (fir, Py, flam. Owls, DWR). *Development will take this into consideration.*

Ensure protection of non-classified streams. Water temperature is of high concern (DFO). *Development will take this into consideration.*

Block Specific Comments from Previous FDP

Block 47 – Road presently accessing top of block indicating adverse skidding. *SBFEP will address this at the layout stage.*

Block 5 – District questions feasibility to select cable harvest downhill. *SBFEP will address this at the layout stage.*

District referenced possible root rot within this block and limited management options to deal with it.

MOE (known information)

The chart area was found to contain flamulated owl.

First Nations

Blocks 43, 47 – The SBFEP will contact the appropriate band(s) to schedule a meeting time and place in order to review the comments/concerns more closely. If, as a result of this meeting, the band(s) still has outstanding concerns, the SBFEP will commit to a further review.

Matthew Creek

General

Future development within this chart must recognize the Management Objectives for Lawless Creek Wildfire.

MOE wants SBFEP to consider deer winter range values in blocks containing Fd.

Midday Creek

MOE (known information)

All fish bearing waters of Spius Creek and its tributaries are designated as "Known Temperature Sensitive Streams".

The Chart area was found to contain flamulated owl and great horned owl.

Otter Mountain

General

Please note that the harvest summary table and mapping for blocks A43034-1 and 12 have been changed from a selection silviculture system as approved in the 1998 FDP to a clearcut with reserves system in the proposed FDP. After further development occurred on these blocks a CCR system was deemed more appropriate.

Block Specific Comments from Previous FDP

A57413-1 – District concerned over possible root disease combined with silviculture system.

A43034-1 – Hudson's Bay Trail may impact this block. If discovered during development consult with the district's recreation department.

MOE (known information)

The chart area was found to contain flamulated and great horned owl as well as an unconfirmed rubber boa den.

Pattinson Lake

General

MOE has stated that this area contains valuable moose habitat. Access and harvesting should be planned with consideration of impact on moose/hunting pressure (i.e. minimize roads, minimize crossings of creeks, buffer roads and cutblocks from creeks and fully deactivate roads not required for short/medium term access. *The SBFEP will consider this during development.*

First Nations

Quaries identified during development in this chart will be noted and protection of these sites will be discussed with the UNIB.

Pennask Lake

General

Development must be in accordance with the Pennask LRUP.

Discussions have been ongoing with Gorman Brothers regarding adjacency.

Pimainus Lake

General

Access management is a priority for MOE in this chart due to wild fish stocks, ungulate populations and potential/existing hunting/fishing pressures. New access should be carefully considered. Permanent deactivation should be a priority for unneeded roads.. *The SBFEP will take this into consideration for future planning in this chart.*

Chart area has high recreational values south of lake / The Spaist Mountain Trail is located within the chart. *SBFEP will consult with the district's recreation officer for future development associated with the above issues.*

Pimainus Lakes Lodge (Mr. Kirkpatrick), must be referred proposed development prior to development in this area.

Schedule harvesting of sales within this area to avoid conflict with recreational activities.

First Nations

The NTA has expressed concern over the proposed Category A blocks 1-4. *The SBFEP will contact the appropriate band(s) to schedule a meeting time and place in order to review the comments/concerns more closely. If, as a result of this meeting, the band(s) still has outstanding concerns, the SBFEP will commit to a further review.*

Quilchena

General

MOE has stated that this area contains valuable moose habitat. Access and harvesting should be planned with consideration of impact on moose/hunting pressure,i.e. minimize roads, minimize crossings of creeks, buffer roads and cutblocks from creeks and fully deactivate roads not required for short/medium term access. *The SBFEP will consider this during development.*

DFO is concerned with peak flows over a portion of the Quilchena chart and how it will affect stream channel stability. *The SBFEP will consult DFO during development.*

District has indicated that this chart area is within a NDT 3 timber type and larger blocks

can be considered if consistent with DFO concerns and IWAP results.

First Nations

Block 20, 5 - The SBFEP will contact the appropriate band(s) to schedule a meeting time and place in order to review the comments/concerns more closely. If, as a result of this meeting, the band(s) still has outstanding concerns, the SBFEP will commit to a further review.

Rabbitt Mountain

General

Please note that development on the Tulameen Firesafe Community Project is nearing completion. After field confirmation in the summer/fall of 2000 it was determined that only the mid to southern portion of A43959-1 will be managed for firesafe objectives and the remainder of block 1, 2 and 3 will be reassessed for potential selection or clearcut with reserve silviculture systems at a later date. The SBFEP is not aware of any cemetery impacting these developments.

Please note that the harvest summary table and mapping for blocks A42319-1 and A42327-1 have been changed from a selection silviculture system as approved in the 1998 FDP to a clearcut with reserves system in the proposed FDP. After further development occurred on these blocks a CCR system was deemed more appropriate.

MOE (known information)

The chart area was found to contain mountain beaver and flamulated owl.

Railroad Creek

General

This chart is located within the Sutter Creek grizzly bear compartment. Open dates are from 2000-2005. The SBFEP is planning their activities to be consistent with these dates (please refer to Table 4.1 Harvest Summary Table).

MOE (known information)

The chart area was found to contain mountain beaver.

Teepee Creek

General

District questioned why SBFEP was not using existing roads. *The existing roads in question are old mine trails and are not suitable for upgrade.*

First Nations

Blocks 10, 16, 13- The SBFEP will contact the appropriate band(s) to schedule a meeting time and place in order to review the comments/concerns more closely. If, as a result of this meeting, the band(s) still has outstanding concerns, the SBFEP will commit to a further review.

Tyner Lake

MOE has raised concerns regarding number of NC streams and IWAP red flags. SBFEP development should focus on riparian retention and avoid large cutblocks until the red flags are dealt with. MOE also stated that water temperature is an issue in this drainage. *SBFEP development will take this into consideration.*

Tyner-Pimainus

General

This smallwood area is being sold under two separate licenses; NRFL A61106 and NRFL A65542. As such the licensees will have to prepare their own FDP and can incorporate the 1998 SBFEP FDP comments at that time. At present we are showing them in our plan as category A approved blocks to make the transition from FDP to FDP less onerous.

Wallace Creek

General

DFO is concerned proposed development could further increase indices in Midday Creek IWAP. *SBFEP will review IWAP findings and discuss proposed development with DFO if required.*

MOE has stated that this chart borders DWR and that blocks in the lower elevation of the IDF with favorable aspects consider these values. *SBFEP development will reflect this.*

All fish bearing waters of Spius Creek and its tributaries are designated as "Known Temperature Sensitive Streams".

Whipsaw

General

Proposed development should account for MOE's Elk Corridor mapping.

7.5 Amendment Log

8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Information consulted in plan preparation.

Information Source	Date of publication	Attachments
Ministry of Forests - Forest Development Plan Template	June, 1998	
Interim Large Cutblock Harvesting Strategy – Policy	1996-10-16	1997-10-10
Wildlife Tree Patch Retention Letter – Policy	1996-06-14	1997-10-10
Short Term Strategy for CWD	August 1999	
Douglas-fir Retention Policy for the Merritt TSA	1999-05-18	
Forest Connectivity Corridors, Old Forests	1997-10-10	
Guidance to achieving biodiversity, hydrological and wildlife values during MPB harvesting	1999-03-15	
Designation of Known Temperature Sensitive Streams	2000-01-27	
Fisheries Agency Referral Requirements	2000-07-28	
Instream Work and Window Terms	1999-09-13	
Forest Health Evaluations for Root Disease	1997-10-10	
Mountain Pine Beetle Strategy for the Merritt Forest District	2000-11	
2000 IBM incidence/risk/susceptibility	2000 data files	
District Manager Lakes' Classifications	1998-07-29	
Lakeshore Management Zones – Merritt TSA	1998-07-29	
Objectives for Recreation Sites, Trails or Interpretive Sites	2000-01-31	
Visual Inventory and Scenic Areas Within the Merritt TSA	1999-07-02	
Establishment of VQO's around lakes in the Merritt TSA	1999-07-02	
Kamloops Regional Visual Impact Assessment Guidelines	2000-05-05	
Licensed domestic water supply intakes and related infrastructure	1999-10-13	
Interior Watershed Reconnaissance Level Strategy for the Merritt TSA	1997-10-07	
Ungulate Winter Range Strategy	1998-10-13	
Guiding Principles for Grizzly Bear Habitat Protection	1999-10-22	
Species at Risk	1999-09-15	
SBFEP Known Information Package as provided by MOELP	1999-09-15	

9. MAPS

FDP Maps are an integral part of the FDP. They visually represent much of the information requirement of the FDP, including area under the plan. FDP maps include the FDP 1:30,000 base maps, the FSR/Road Permit Maintenance Maps, and the Beetle overview map.

9.1 Status Maps

The District Manager has supplied the following maps for licensee and SBFEP use:

- Visual Objectives
- Deer Winter Range
- Guides and Trappers
- Range Tenure Holders
- Licensee Operating Areas
- Community Watersheds

These maps will be utilized for planning purposes, but will not be resubmitted as part of this FDP (unless it is deemed a legislative requirement).